

Mr. McNARY. I think it would be impossible to come to an agreement this evening. I therefore suggest that we follow the suggestion of the Senator from Kentucky and let the matter go over until tomorrow.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Frankly, I should much prefer to have the matter go over until tomorrow, because I have not had an opportunity to analyze the various suggestions which have been made.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no doubt that we can satisfactorily work out the matter by tomorrow. I therefore suggest that it go over.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is agreeable to me.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, October 26, 1939, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., vice president, Georgetown University, regent, School of Foreign Service, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal Father, in whom and by whom all creation moves through law unto its appointed end, preside, we beseech Thee, over the deliberations of this day, and make manifest in them the wisdom befitting sons of God. Illumine with Thy grace the intellects of those who here share with Thee the dread responsibility of governing mortal ways. Strengthen their wills to safeguard equal justice unto all, with malice to none. Suffuse their hearts with charity that is patient and understanding of human weakness, tolerant of each man's groping for the light, but resolute in a justice that fears not to do battle for the right nor flinches ever before the insolence of wrong.

Keep from our beloved land the withering blight and scourge of fratricidal war now afflicting with sore distress our fellow men beyond the seas. Banish hatred from all council chambers and disunion of mind among the people. Let not the curse of Cain find habitation on our shores or in our hearts; but make true peace, like a tree planted beside running waters, flourish from generation unto generation forevermore. To that end guide, protect, and accompany in this hour the President of these United States, the Speaker of this House, and all the Members thereof, that never word or act of theirs find disfavor in Thy sight or be reckoned as false counsel before that impartial tribunal where every man and nation must one day stand for judgment. A blessing we do ask in the name of Him whom Thou didst send, Jesus Christ, the Redeemer of the world. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, cwing to unavoidable circumstances, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] will not be able to use the time allotted him this morning. I therefore ask that the order previously made in his behalf be canceled, and I ask unanimous consent that he may be given 30 minutes to address the House tomorrow after the disposition of the legislative program and orders previously made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by Col. Edward N. Wentworth, commander in chief of the Military Order of the World War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune urging the adoption of House Resolution 316.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDOWELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a short newspaper article from the Parkersburg News of Parkersburg, W. Va.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THILL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein an address I made before the Illinois Press Association at the University of Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOLLES]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following any orders that have been heretofore entered, my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] may be permitted to speak for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein an address by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES], at the National Forum on Sunday night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a summary of the discretionary war powers of the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein an editorial by the President General of the Sons of the American Revolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes today at the conclusion of any previous orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELSON]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein the membership of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELSON]?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, looking at that it appears as if it is quite voluminous. How many pages will that take?

Mr. THORKELSON. I do not believe it will take very many pages, maybe two and a half or three.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me, from the looks of that manuscript the gentleman has there, it will take more than that.

Mr. THORKELSON. This contains only names.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, is not somebody somewhere, at some place, sometime going to object to all this stuff going into the RECORD? It seems to me it is too much. I am going to ask the gentleman to get an estimate from the Public Printer first before he submits his request to determine what that is going to cost. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his request for the time being.

Mr. THORKELSON. I will be very glad to get an estimate for the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman withdraw the request?

Mr. THORKELSON. Yes, Mr. Speaker; I withdraw the request.

STEAMSHIP "CITY OF FLINT"

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE CASE OF THE "CITY OF FLINT"

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I have seen a good many newspaper articles which display agitation with regard to the fact that the vessel *City of Flint* has been captured and taken into a Russian port. It seems that this is an American vessel loaded with contraband destined for the Allies. If this American ship were carrying contraband goods, I do not see any difference between the Germans capturing it and taking it into port and the situation where the English capture an American vessel carrying contraband of war destined for a German port. I, for one, believe that the American people ought to reserve their opinion on this incident and that the newspapers ought to be cautious about urging the involvement of America in foreign entanglements. If American shippers and American shipping are doing anything contrary to international law, then, as I see it, we have no grievance against any nation if such vessels are captured. I hope we will be neutral. [Applause.]

I understand that every day from the docks in New York City boats are being loaded with munitions of war destined to England, France, Japan, and other countries by bootleggers in war materials. If men of this stripe want to take a chance on their investments, if American steamship companies want to take a chance of losing their ships for the sake of getting double profits if they deliver the cargo, let them assume the full responsibility, let them do the worrying. The people of the United States are not called upon to become all upset about it, nor is it the duty of the President or the Congress to protect bootleggers. Proper enforcement of the laws would mean their suppression. The laxity in the situation is on the part of the Government in not enforcing the laws in the waters of New York to see that contraband is not shipped. If this country's laws are willfully violated by our own vessels and shipowners, let them make the best of it and take their medicine. The American people should not let misguided and misplaced sympathy run away with their logic in the situation.

WHO GETS THE MONEY?

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have recently completed reading and studying a little book entitled "Who Gets the Money?" by Walter Rautenstrauch. The first edition of this book appeared about 5 years ago. I read it and studied it then. The new edition is much more valuable for the ordinary reader and student. It clearly shows that the income of the United States is increasing for those in the so-called higher brackets—the overheads, the control group. The proportionate income for those less privileged is constantly decreasing year by year, especially for the farmers and laborers. The farmer's income has dropped from 14.2 percent of the

national income in 1919 to 7.1 percent in 1934. Probably it will be about 7.5 percent in 1939.

Modern invention has largely channeled the income of the United States in larger volume into the pockets of those who have. A smaller portion of the national income reaches the farmer and laborer, those classes that forever must ask, "What price will you give me for my products?" or "What price will you give me for my labor?" and, on the other hand, ask, "What price do you now ask for these gadgets?"—gadgets that the modern life demands in every avenue of activity where it is possible to have them.

I am happy to present for the RECORD a review of this valuable book written by Dr. Carl Thompson, of the Public Ownership League of America, in Chicago, who will be glad to correspond with interested readers. In presenting it, I desire to quote from the author's preface:

It is asserted that the focal points of control of the business process are embodied in the laws we have made which determine:

A. Who shall have access to the raw materials we need for living and upon what terms?

B. Who shall decide that the tools we all need shall or shall not be used or made available to create wealth and upon what terms?

C. How the claims to the goods produced (money or income) are apportioned.

The vast majority of our political problems, both national and international, have their roots in these areas of human interest. More specifically, the great issues of the day revolve around the central problem: Who gets the money? No group of people can live together happily and develop a great culture that will long endure unless this central problem is satisfactorily dealt with.

WHO GETS THE MONEY?—AN EVER-DECREASING INCOME TO THE PRODUCING CLASSES AND A CORRESPONDING INCREASING INCOME TO THE NONPRODUCING CLASSES WRECKS THE SOCIAL ORDER

(A book review by Dr. Carl D. Thompson)

Two or three years ago there was published by Harper Brothers a very interesting and significant little book under the above title, "Who Gets the Money?", by Walter Rautenstrauch. This book has recently been entirely revised and a new edition published.

It is one of the most remarkable and significant books, in our judgment, of recent economic literature.

What makes this book so important and significant, we think, is the fact that it goes straight to the heart of the most serious maladjustment in our present economic and social order.

"OVERHEAD" GETS THE MONEY

Professor Rautenstrauch believes that the one thing that is wrong with our present social and economic order is the fact that those who are engaged in producing the wealth of the country are receiving an ever-decreasing proportion of the national income, whereas those who are engaged in what he calls "overhead activities," depending on their investments, interest, and dividends received from them, and those who live by speculation are receiving an ever-increasing proportion of the national income.

This contention the author supports by a very exhaustive and thoroughgoing study of facts and data which are presented in elaborate tables, charts, diagrams, etc., in such a way as to leave no chance for successful refutation. He shows, for example, that whereas the average income of those engaged in productive activities, including farmers, miners, laborers, etc., has decreased since 1919 from \$1,150 per year to \$910 per year in 1934, on the other hand, those engaged in the overhead activities, such as banking, investment, etc., drawing interest, dividends, and the like, have had their incomes increased from \$1,390 per year on the average in 1919 to \$1,500 per year in 1934. These facts are set forth briefly in the following table:

	Amount	Earned	Average per year (each)
Number of employees in production:			
1919.....	25,861,000	\$28,836,000,000	\$1,150
1934.....	19,743,000	17,910,000,000	910
Number in overhead:			
1919.....	14,421	20,140,000,000	1,390
1934.....	17,563	26,247,000,000	1,500

In other words, while the income of the producing classes has been steadily decreasing, the income of the overhead group has been steadily increasing.

SHIFT OF NINE BILLIONS A YEAR

Putting it in another way, the author shows, in his earlier edition, that there was a shift of over \$9,000,000,000 of income per year from the incomes of the producing classes (wage workers and farmers) to the incomes of the nonproductive classes, or overhead groups, as he calls them.

Now, the fact that the overhead groups constitute a very small proportion of the entire earning population, whereas the producing

classes (wage workers, farmers, etc.) constitute a very much greater proportion of the entire population, this shift from the incomes of the producing classes to the incomes of the non-producing classes results in a serious decrease in the purchasing power of the Nation as a whole. And this, in turn, throws the entire economic order out of balance. "The whole group of productive enterprise," the author writes, "is receiving less and less of the total national income. * * * This system," he goes on to say, "causes a greater and greater proportion of the goods produced to go to capital, with the result that the whole economy becomes unworkable."

THE FARMER IS THE GOAT

In analyzing the incomes of the various classes the author shows that "the farmers' proportion of the national income is steadily declining. Look at the farmers," he says. "In 1919 they received 14.2 percent of the national income. In 1929 they dropped to 8.7 percent of the national income, and in 1934 they dropped still further, to 7.1 percent." In other words, of all of the classes of the country the farmer received the smallest proportion of the income.

Thus, by steadily decreasing the income of the producing classes of the Nation, constituting by far its greater proportion of the population, while at the same time increasing the proportion paid to the nonproducing classes, the system destroyed the purchasing power of those who would have used their income for purchasing the products of the national organization, and thus destroyed the balance between purchasing power and producing power.

THE REMEDY

To remedy this the author urges that "the most important job we have before us is to adopt rules and regulations which will make our industrial system work to full capacity. To accomplish this we must do something about who gets the money. We must distribute the national income in workable proportions, that is, in such proportions between capital and labor as will keep the national factory producing goods."

PUBLIC WORKS AND FULL EMPLOYMENT

How is this to be done? In a final chapter the author gives his answer to this question in a most interesting and constructive manner. "We must provide every employable person with a job," he says. That is obviously first and fundamental. But just as vital is the contention that the rewards of service in the social order shall be equitably apportioned so that purchasing power shall be balanced with producing power. And this is to be accomplished, the author insists, by the extension of "those types of organizations which have done more for us than any others, such as public schools, highways, parks. * * * Such organizations have been the most successful in withstanding the blighting hand of selfish greed." Here the author evidently has in mind the great field of public works, public and municipal projects, which has been so enormously extended in recent years but has been steadily expanding throughout the history of the country. He does not go into detail on these matters. For that one needs to turn to another book written a year or two ago by Dr. John Bauer on *Permanent Prosperity and How to Get It*.

And how are these great expansions of the public service to be financed? "The Government should carry out the provisions of the Constitution which prescribe that 'the Congress shall have the power to coin money, etc. * * * All banking institutions should be operated in the interests of the public welfare and purchasing power integrated with the production of goods.'"

Thus the author sets out the one vital element so sadly lacking in many of the discussions of the subject, viz, the means by which our public works and enterprises can be sufficiently expanded to absorb all the unemployed without increasing the public debt to crushing proportions, and at the same time increasing the purchasing power of the people until it balances their producing power and thus stabilizing the social and economic order.

Our program, the author holds, should provide every employable person with a job; it should distribute the wealth we create with some regard to the social service rendered by those who serve the needs of the community. "It should provide a form of cooperative relationship between all groups of people which will give everyone a voice in economic affairs as well as in political affairs, that is, establish an economic democracy."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a brief and quite striking study on this book by Dr. Carl D. Thompson, president of the Public Ownership League of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HAWKS] may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial on inland waterways.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including therein an address delivered by Harold G. Moulton, president of the Brookings Institution, entitled "Industrial Price Policies in This Emergency." I have checked with the Government Printing Office and find that this matter will take up two and one-quarter pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at an estimated cost of \$102.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a special order of the House heretofore entered, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN], is recognized for 20 minutes.

LET US RETAIN THE ARMS EMBARGO

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that I am forced to differ with President Roosevelt on the issue for which Congress was called into extra session, namely, revision of the present Neutrality Act. That most important question was first brought up in the form of a bill in 1935, my first year as a Member of this great body. There was no feeling then that any power on earth was to be benefited by that proposal except the United States, in that it would make it more difficult for us to become involved in another European war. We took plenty of time to deliberate on the questions involved, and soon the bill became law without hardly any opposition from anyone, either in or out of Congress.

In 1936 certain changes were made which were intended to improve and strengthen the neutrality measure, and again in 1937. During the regular session this year this same question that we are considering was debated pro and con, and finally passed with the arms embargo still intact by this House. Really, all this Congress should do is to re-enact the cash-and-carry provision on everything except arms, munitions, and implements of war. That should have been taken up separately the first day we were here and could have been passed with little opposition in a very short time.

But that was not permitted to be done by those who favor repeal because that would have taken away their main talking point, namely, the danger of our ships becoming involved and being sunk and that would eventually involve us in the war. What has that got to do with the repeal of the arms embargo? The thing that will insure the sinking of our ships will be to repeal the arms embargo. Even if we enact cash and carry and include arms and munitions, we will have to realize that American ships will be lost. Under the present bill being considered by the other body our shipping interests are kicking about the restrictions being placed upon them, and it is proposed even now, before the bill is even debated for amendments, to make concessions to these shipping interests. No one wants to be restricted; our Americans are used to freedom from interference by anyone, and even many individuals feel that Congress or the President has no right to tell them when and where they can go. Many of the large industries, no doubt, feel that now there would be a chance to cash in and make some nice profits. Others feel that now is the chance to end the depression and unemployment by selling arms, munitions, and implements of war.

Oh, yes; many of our American citizens clamor for the repeal of the present arms embargo. They are after profits at the expense of our American youth, who would have to pay with their lives and their blood. It would be at the expense of our American mothers; they would pay for it in fear, agony, and despair, while their sons were at the front, waiting to be blown to bits.

I am not saying that by repealing the arms embargo we would be drawn into the European war, but it could and, per-

haps would, be one fatal step toward it. At least, millions of our youth and millions of mothers, who pray daily that we may not become involved, will, as sure as we live today, blame the repeal of the arms embargo for our entry in case we should become involved. I do not want to take that blame; and to those who feel that they are entitled to make some profit, to those who feel that this would bring back prosperity, to those millions now unemployed, some of whom feel that this European war and the repeal of the arms embargo would provide them with good, paying jobs, I must say, in the words of our President, "Don't be misled; it is nothing but fool's gold."

I quote from the President's speech at Chautauqua in 1936, when he strongly favored arms embargo as a means of keeping us out of war:

It is clear that our present policy and the measures passed by the Congress would, in the event of a war on some other continent, reduce war profits which would otherwise accrue to American citizens. Industrial and agricultural production for a war market may give immense fortunes to a few men. For the Nation as a whole it produces disaster.

It was the prospect of war profits that caused the extension of monopoly and unjustified expansion of industry and a price level so high that the normal relationship between debtor and creditor was destroyed.

Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

They would tell you—and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity—that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other articles to belligerent nations the unemployed of America would all find work. They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations, that credit would be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts.

They would tell you that America once more would capture the trade of the world.

It would be hard to resist that clamor; it would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond—to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning that comes from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed if war should come would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace.

If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer—must answer—"We choose peace." It is the duty of all of us to encourage such a body of public opinion in this country that the answer will be clear and, for all practical purposes, unanimous.

Those were the words of our President, spoken less than 3 years ago. He said that we would have to choose between "profits and peace." Yes, fellow Members; that is the issue now. We must choose profits or peace now. I am certain that the overwhelming majority of our people, the people who will have to pay for the war with their lives, their blood, and their suffering if we permit this country to drift that way by choosing profits, will demand an explanation from those who vote for the repeal.

LABOR IS WILLING TO SACRIFICE PROFITS FOR PEACE

Another great man who represents millions of Americans that toil in our industries, William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, has spoken against reaching for fool's gold. When he appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in April 1939 he said:

The American Federation of Labor has endorsed the principles upon which the Neutrality Act was based—

That was the same Neutrality Act that carried with it and now carries with it the embargo on munitions of war, the present act—

that a neutral nation has obligations, as well as rights, and that the munitions industry is a matter of public concern. We do not believe that this is the time to make changes in this law, for any change in this legislation might be interpreted as a change in our foreign policy.

We believe that the present neutrality law has served the interests of peace between nations and that it should be continued as it was enacted in 1937.

Mr. Green has since then on many occasions made it clear that labor does not wish to sanction blood money. I had the honor to speak from the same platform with William Green in Superior, Wis., which is the largest city in my district, last Labor Day. He made it very plain that labor must keep its head and not fall for the propaganda that was gaining headway even then that this war would bring back jobs and prosperity and that we should sell all we could to anybody who wanted it. I know that when I made the statement on that

day to several thousand assembled there that I would not vote to change the present act to permit the sale of implements of death and destruction for the sake of profits I was cheered as I have never been cheered before in my life. I am certain that everyone present agreed with my views.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE SPEAKING TO CONGRESS IN NO UNCERTAIN LANGUAGE

That the American people almost unanimously are against participation in this war is, no doubt, agreed to by everybody. And that they likewise want us to do nothing that might have even the slightest tendency toward involvement is also true. We realize that the sympathy of the American people is with France and England in this war and that they want them to be victorious. But, at the same time, the recent Gallup poll showed definitely that the great majority of those voting were against our entry, even if it were certain that Hitler would win without our participation.

I have received over 10,000 letters and cards against arms embargo repeal, and not more than 15 for repeal. Very few of those are sent because of some special group action. Hardly any are the printed or mimeographed kind that is handed to people with instructions to sign and mail. No; 95 percent of my letters come from the hearts of the people, the mothers, fathers, veterans, sons, and daughters, who can look back twenty-odd years ago and who do not want to live through another like period of heartaches and suffering.

Oh, yes; the American people are speaking in unmistakable language and, even though the arms embargo repeal might not get us embroiled in the European war, I would hate to be one of those helping to repeal it and then, if we were forced to enter the war, attempt to explain to my constituents that the repeal had nothing to do with it. I am sure that most of my people would blame it on the sale of arms, munitions, and implements of war and would hold me responsible for the repeal.

There is no mistaking the message of their voice. It is the voice of American manhood and American motherhood. It is the voice of all American citizens who remember the blunder and the stupidity and the failure and the deceit of our participation in the last World War. They insist that the Congress of the United States heed their voice.

They say, we shall fight, if need be, to the last drop of blood and to the last breath of our failing bodies against any attempted invasion by any aggressor. We shall fight against any dictatorship, either from the right or the left, that raises its head and attempts to strangle our present constitutional form of American democracy. They say, we will fight for the defense of our country along every American front but we will not fight any time or anywhere for foreign causes upon foreign battlefields.

They beg the Congress of the United States to keep us out of foreign entangling alliances, whether they be the alliances of international politics or the alliances of the international munitions trade. Let us recognize a difference between arms and ammunition, which are fundamentally and primarily commodities of death, and all other commodities, which are fundamentally and primarily commodities of life, even if the munition makers and their allies, the foreign propagandists, refuse to do so. The people believe that the contemplated repeal of the embargo on arms and ammunition to foreign belligerents means the entrance of the United States into the vestibule of war.

Let us be honest with our constituency and tell them that we wish to help England and France win this war, and that is why we favor repeal of the arms embargo. Let us not call it "the Neutrality Act of 1939." That is not being honest with anybody.

Why do so many people attempt to justify their stand in favor of repeal with the statement that unless we help the Allies and crush Hitler we will be next in line to be swallowed up? Any plain reasoning, of course, does not justify any such assertion. We should be mighty thankful to the Creator for having given this country the most ideal natural protection from an attempted invasion of any part of this world. Hitler and Stalin may be insane and war mad, but they are not crazy enough to attempt to attack us if we

know enough to remain at home and use our energies to fortify and strengthen our natural advantage.

I wish to quote a few remarks made recently by Maj. Gen. Smedley D. Butler, one of the outstanding authorities on naval and military affairs. Among other things, he said in his recent broadcast:

They say, if the British and the French don't lick Hitler, Hitler will be over here on our necks.

He'll be bombing our women and children and shelling our cities. Don't let anybody feed you that misinformation.

It doesn't take a military education to figure out what I'm going to tell you.

It will take not less than 1,000,000 soldiers to invade the United States with any hope of even getting ashore.

These million men must come all at once.

They must bring not less than 7 tons of baggage per man—1,000,000 men, 7,000,000 tons of food, ammunition, and what not.

They must bring 400,000 motor vehicles. They've got to find room for 50 gallons of gasoline per day for each vehicle.

Why, there are not enough ships in the whole world to carry that kind of an expedition. And, remember, those ships have to have enough fuel to get back with—to make the round trip.

Any dumb cluck can see that.

But here's some more: They've got to have harbors to land in; docks to get their stores ashore. You know you can't stop 25 miles out at sea, drop a 5-ton armored tank overboard, and tell it to swim ashore and meet you on Broadway.

You know very well we're not going to open our harbors to them, prepare docks for them, and invite them in.

New York Harbor is the only big one we have on this coast, and to block New York Harbor all you have to do is to dump 2 day's garbage in the channel instead of hauling it out to sea.

And don't forget that we happen to have a navy, and it's the best in the world.

Now, what about an aerial invasion?

Well, Colonel Lindbergh and Eddie Rickenbacker, the two foremost fliers we have, already have told you it's ridiculous to talk or to think about bombing New York from Berlin.

And don't forget that we have an air force of our own.

I agree with those statements, and feel certain that no one over there will believe that they could successfully cross the ocean and land sufficient troops over here to get a start. They would not dare to leave there, even if they thought they could land here.

If Hitler and Stalin should be victorious, they would not dare to take a million men and necessary supplies and equipment out of there, because these conquered nations would most certainly be right on their backs to win back lost territory.

I feel we are quite secure from any invasion, and therefore we should remain neutral as the word implies. Let us not call it neutrality when everybody knows that to repeal the arms embargo when war is in progress, and after we have had the Arms Embargo Act on our statute books for 4 years, would be unneutral. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask that, following the special orders heretofore entered for today, I may be permitted to address the House for 4 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the address of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] today I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CROWE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include

therein a radio address delivered by former Governor Pinchot, of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Government Printing Office for an estimate with regard to the list of the members of the American League for Peace and Democracy, which a few moments ago I requested permission to insert in the RECORD, and have been advised that it will come within the two-page limit. I now ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein this list.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana renews his request to have inserted in the RECORD a list of the members of an organization known as the American League for Peace and Democracy. Is there objection?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, how much does the Public Printer think it would cost?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. It comes within the regular limit of two pages.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. How much is that?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. That means the regular pages in the RECORD.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. What is it in dollars and cents?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I do not know what it is in dollars and cents, but it comes within the regular limit of two pages on extraneous matter allowed to be placed in the RECORD.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. It was my purpose to find out how much this would cost, and I shall not object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I call for a quorum.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Wyoming rise?

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address given by former President Hoover on the 20th of this month.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request for a quorum.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States is now engaged in considering the subject of neutrality, and its decisions thereon may be the most momentous that it has been called upon to make since the dark days of 1917. In these decisions, which may well mean life or death for tens of thousands of our boys, there can be no thought of partisanship. The one supreme purpose of the people of the United States, as evidenced by the overwhelming weight of their public and private expressions, is to keep America out of the war, and that should be the supreme purpose of Congress in considering the pending legislation.

In 1935, when it became apparent that Europe was heading into another war, Congress passed the Neutrality Act, prohibiting the shipment of arms, ammunition, or implements of war from the United States to any country that is at war. In 1936 Congress amended the neutrality law by provisions designed to strengthen it, but did not change the provision prohibiting the shipment of arms to warring nations. In 1937 Congress passed another act extending the embargo on the shipment of arms to belligerents in the civil war in Spain, and again in the same year, with the European war more evidently imminent, Congress entirely rewrote the neutrality law, clarifying and strengthening its provisions and retaining therein the embargo on the shipment of arms to warring nations. All this was done in contemplation of that which has now happened, and which was then so clearly seen to be imminent, that is, the outbreak of war between Germany on one side and Great Britain and France on the other.

In adopting this device of the arms embargo Congress did not adopt anything new or untried. The arms embargo is a device that has been adopted from time to time by practically all of the great nations of the world when the exigencies of some particular situation seem to threaten their peace. It was adopted first by the United States in 1794, followed by an act in 1797 and another in 1798. Later in 1838 another Embargo Act was passed by Congress, and still another in 1898, which latter law remained in force until it was amended in the year 1912. That act was extended and reenacted in 1922, and in 1934 a joint resolution was passed embargoing the shipment of arms to Bolivia and Paraguay in their conflict over the Chaco. Other nations similarly using the embargo as an instrument of national policy are Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Great Britain, Denmark, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland.

Now after the war has started, which was in immediate contemplation when our neutrality law was enacted, we are asked to repeal the embargo against the shipment of arms to warring nations. Is it not strange that we should so soon seriously consider the reversal of a policy so recently and so deliberately framed? The purpose then was to keep America at peace. Our purpose now must remain the same, and the question asked when the embargo provision was enacted was, Will it help to keep us out of war? Congress then answered that question in the affirmative. I submit that the same question must be asked now when we propose to undo what then was done, and before any Member is justified in voting to repeal the arms embargo he must answer in the affirmative the same question, Will it help to keep us out of war?

In attempting to answer for myself this most momentous question, my mind goes back to the fateful days from 1915 to 1917. We were truly neutral at the start of the World War, but gradually the Allies began to buy munitions here. In time we became their arsenal and their source of supplies, and as war orders grew, a subtle change was little by little wrought in our attitude toward the belligerents in that war. The Allies were our best customers. It was evident that our prosperity depended upon them. We had chosen our side, and our sympathies were naturally there. Under the circumstances Germany did the only thing she could do. She tried to stop the flow of our munitions to the allied countries with every resource at her command. There were bombings and explosions in our munitions factories, with loss of American lives and property. There were bombings and explosions in railroad tunnels and on railroad bridges, designed to halt the transportation of these munitions to the seacoast, almost always with loss of more lives. There were burnings and explosions on docks and piers where munitions were stored, sinking of munition ships, clever sabotage of machinery and equipment, and as each new outrage occurred, it added fuel to the flame of our anger until it was burning at white heat, fanned all the time by the winds of allied propaganda, the so-called atrocity stories, and when the sinking of the *Lusitania* occurred and the German orders for unrestricted submarine warfare were issued, the great transformation of American minds was completed. Our pent-up anger exploded, and America declared war.

Now at the very outset of this war it is proposed that we start down that same path. If we do, can there be any doubt to what tragic destination it leads?

What were the steps along the path to war as we took them in 1917? First, the manufacture and shipment of munitions to one side, the Allied Powers; second, German outrages perpetrated in an attempt to stop them; and third, mounting anger in our hearts for these outrages, fanned by propaganda and atrocity stories, repeated day after day, and then the final step—war. That was the path; those were the steps; that was the end in 1917. Will it be any different in 1940? The lifting of the embargo is the first step on the path that has no turning.

I know the overwhelming weight of sympathy in this country is with Great Britain and France, Poland and Czechoslovakia, and if a Member of Congress is permitted to express his personal sympathy, there is where mine lies, but I dare not permit my personal sympathy for one side or another in

a European war to guide me as a Member of Congress in writing legislation that will mean the difference between safety and peril for America. This is no time for divided allegiance nor for multiple purposes. Our allegiance and our whole duty is to one country, America, and our purpose must be single—to keep her out of war.

Many of the provisions of the pending legislation, in my opinion, will tend to keep America at peace, and those I shall favor, but the one provision for the repeal of the arms embargo jeopardizes everything.

If we feel ourselves endangered, let us manufacture armaments and munitions of war for ourselves. Our Army is equipped, for the most part, with outmoded weapons of World War days. Let us equip the Army with the latest and the best. If our air forces are inadequate, let us make them adequate to our needs. If our Navy is insufficient, let us build it to the point of sufficiency. An adequate army, an adequate navy, and an adequate air force, adequate in material and in men, is probably our best protection and insurance against war in our generation. The reequipment of our armed forces will give employment, if that is a consideration, to thousands in practically every line of industry, but it seems to me that more substantial and far more promising than any boom in the manufacture of munitions of war and holding out promise of enduring prosperity in the days of peace, are the markets of the world that now lie open to us because those who have hitherto supplied them are at war. Why should we not devote ourselves, so far as our foreign commerce is concerned, to intensive cultivation of the peacetime markets that will be ours for the taking and which will remain, in large part, ours after the war in Europe has been concluded?

What I have heretofore said is based upon a profound conviction that this war in Europe is not our war. Its issues and purposes, framed by secret diplomatic intrigue and shifting from day to day as this or that national interest is served or threatened, are unknown to us and cannot be known; for instance, what part is Russia playing in the present turmoil? A British and French diplomatic and military mission held protracted sessions with Soviet officials immediately preceding the outbreak of the war. Their discomfort seemed complete when, while this mission was still in Moscow, Russia signed her famous nonaggression treaty with Germany. Apparently Germany had won a major diplomatic victory; but had she? As events unfold, it now appears that in signing the treaty with Russia, Germany alienated her two firm friends, Japan and Italy, and the suspicion is aroused that allied diplomacy, by Hitler's Russian maneuver, has won a diplomatic victory of incalculable magnitude. What commitments did France and England make to Turkey to bring her into alliance with them? Where does Italy stand? The answers to these questions cannot be given by anyone in America. They depend upon a maze of treaties, ententes, understandings, and conversations concerning debts, economic and military resources, and spheres of influence which constitute the power politics of Europe. Americans should understand that the basis of European alignments is as shifting and unstable as the wind-blown sands of the desert and in which we have no part. We have been told that the fight is between the nations that have and the nations that have not, and just when we are prepared to believe that this simple and understandable difference is the basis for the grouping of the powers, Russia, who has a greater stretch of contiguous territory than any other nation in the world, and who is indisputably one of the "have nations," associates herself with the head of the "have not" group, Germany, and signs a treaty of nonaggression with another of that group, Japan, the spirit of which she promptly breaks by increasing her shipments of arms and munitions of war to China. We are also told that the fight is between the totalitarian nations and the democracies, and no sooner are we prepared to believe in this simple and understandable classification of nations than the democracies take to their bosom the chief exponent of totalitarianism in western Asia—Turkey. No, the truth of the matter is that there is no easily understandable nor firmly fixed line of demarcation

between any two groups of nations in Europe. They are all pursuing nationalistic policies in which their national interests, as they consider them to be for the moment, are their all absorbing concerns, and it has ever been so.

These temporary alignments and the intrigue and secret diplomacy that give rise to them constitute the so-called power politics of Europe and the maintenance of an equilibrium on the Continent of Europe constitutes the so-called balance of power in Europe. No one can read the history of Great Britain without being struck by the fact that for practically 400 years she has been in the middle of a European political seesaw, sometimes by means of exports, sometimes by means of imports, sometimes through the money power of her pound sterling, sometimes by the force of her arms, and sometimes by the might of her navy, she has maintained the equilibrium of Europe and has moved from one side to the other of the center of the political seesaw, always playing off some nations against other nations in order that no nation or combination of nations of which she was not a part should obtain a balance of power sufficient to imperil her empire. Of necessity, in recent years France has had to go along with England in this movement from side to side of the European seesaw, and for the most part the shifting combinations of nations which Great Britain has sponsored have been able to maintain the equilibrium, but through the decades and the centuries, wherever British economic and political power has been insufficient to maintain the equilibrium she has been forced to and has accepted the challenge of war. That was the situation in the World War and that is the situation today. Then we were asked to fight to make the world safe for democracy. What will be the slogan in the present war?

A hundred and forty-three years ago last month a very wise man and a great patriot, who had in his time watched the play and interplay of the political forces of Europe, and who had the benefit of intimate knowledge of the history of some 300 years of European power politics, gave to his countrymen sound words of advice when he said:

Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forgo the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Keogh). The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for a hundred and twenty-one years we followed this advice of the great Washington and during that time, by keeping ourselves free from European entanglements, by recognizing that European interests had no permanent attachments and had for us a very remote concern, we kept free of Europe's quarrels. We conserved our resources instead of wasting them in fruitless wars in Europe, and we grew great—great and powerful. And then after 121 years, betrayed by our own emotions, our own sympathies and predilections we abandoned the course that wisdom had charted for us. We picked our side and we became the manufacturer of munitions of war as we are now asked to do again. The result of that deviation was tragic

beyond the power of words to describe, an internal economy upset by the exactions and temptations of wartime boom prosperity from whose disastrous effects the Nation has not yet recovered, the expenditure of more than \$40,000,000,000 in the gigantic effort of war over a period of 18 months, now stretching out through subsequent necessary expenditures to a total of more than \$55,000,000,000, more than 50,000 of our boys dead on the field of battle, 25,000 more dead from their wounds or disease, 250,000 more wounded and maimed, all because we lost our heads. We forsook the counsels of wisdom, we let our emotions dictate our actions. Now it is proposed to start all over again that same fatal chain of circumstances which began with the furnishing of munitions of war to the Allied Powers in 1915. Who can with any confidence assert that the result will be any different now?

But, Mr. Speaker, we dare not go to war now. When we entered the World War our national debt was only about a billion and a quarter. We came out of that war with a national debt of more than \$26,000,000,000, a staggering sum, but if we enter this present war we shall enter with a national debt of more than \$41,000,000,000. How much more debt can this Nation stand and survive? The piled-up national debt at the conclusion of a long-drawn-out war will bankrupt America and make dictatorship, which is the receivership of bankrupt nations, inevitable. Already plans have been made for a so-called streamlined government that will take over the affairs of this Nation immediately on the advent of war. For the outline of these plans see the Washington Times-Herald of September 21, 1939. The term "Streamlined government" is the pleasant-sounding name for the harsh reality of dictatorship. In the prosecution of this new war the rights of individuals and of groups will have to be, and will be, submerged to the will of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. All this in the interest of the efficient prosecution of the war.

One after the other we have seen the democracies of the world wither and die before the blighting sun of dictatorship. Will it be any different here? Are not the danger signals flying all around us, warning us of what we may expect at the conclusion of the war? Even in times of peace the drift here has been toward collectivization and dictatorship. Unusual powers granted to the President, a huge bureaucracy created for the regulation of the citizens. Once these liberties are surrendered for the prosecution of the war, will they ever be returned? No one can assert with any confidence that they will.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that every citizen who loves liberty, every group or association of citizens, whose rights are protected under the Constitution, must oppose America's entry into the new war in Europe and consequently oppose any step in that direction. Under dictatorship here the rights and privileges which we enjoy as freely as the air we breathe will vanish, and in their place will be rules, regulations, commands, and dictates, all of which are abhorrent to us. Under dictatorship business will be put in a strait jacket and businessmen become the servants of the state. Labor unions will lose their privileges and their members become merged in the great mass of workers who work for the state. Religious organizations will become agencies for the state, to be dictated to as those who rule the state may wish. These are the bitter fruits of dictatorship.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that here in the western world, separated as we are by 3,000 miles of rolling ocean from the conflagration in Europe, we can and we must keep the peace. Every dictate of personal and national interest demands that we do so. We have no vital interest in the shifting alliances and antagonisms that constitute the jungle of European power politics. We should clearly understand that what is proposed in the pending legislation is the first step on the path that has no turning, the path that led to war in 1917 and that will lead to war in 1940 or 1941.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. PATRICK. First, I want to compliment the gentleman on his very excellent and able address this afternoon,

and I believe the gentleman will find us all in agreement on one statement or one policy that he is committed to, and that is that our first and our greatest duty is to ourselves—

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Our only duty, I should say.

Mr. PATRICK. Our only duty? All right, leave it that way; but I am asking the question, if by that same token a program is adopted that not only tends, but has probably already driven munition factories out of America, will not that prepare for the manufacturing of the very things in other countries that the gentleman states should be manufactured here to prepare us for the saddest eventuality?

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. I will answer that question by saying to the gentleman that the factories we already have are sufficient for America's needs in arming ourselves and in preparing ourselves for any war. I submit to the gentleman that we can darken the skies with airplanes by the use of the manufacturing equipment that we now have in this country, and make absolutely impossible any invasion by air. I submit to the gentleman that we have now in existence in this country navy yards sufficient to build any navy that we may determine to build. We have factories for the manufacture of explosives sufficient in their capacity, without expansion, to equip with high explosives any army or any navy or any air force that we may put at the service of the Nation.

Mr. PATRICK. Does the gentleman want to drive that into Europe and into Canada?

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Drive what?

Mr. PATRICK. Drive those manufacturing industries?

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Will the gentleman kindly tell me how it is possible to pick up a factory in Detroit and move it to Windsor, Canada, or a navy yard at Norfolk and move it to Halifax?

Mr. PATRICK. If the gentleman lived in a manufacturing district, as I do, and had seen the smokestacks of industry taken down and then opened up somewhere else, he would not ask me how such a thing could be done.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Let me answer the gentleman by saying that I do live in a manufacturing district.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 10 minutes more to answer the questions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. I live in a manufacturing district. I represent the great upper Ohio Valley, with steel mills all along it, and I say to the gentleman that any prosperity that comes to that section of the country, or that comes to this country, as a result of engaging in the manufacture of munitions of war is, as the President has characterized it, "fool's gold." [Applause.]

Mr. PATRICK. Then why—

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Just a minute; and when the war ends, prosperity ends, and these multitudinous problems that have been taxing this Congress and preceding Congresses for the past 8 years, and that to this moment remain unsolved, with their solution not even started, will be magnified and intensified by that sort of search for "fool's gold."

Mr. PATRICK. Then why does the gentleman want an embargo law on the books that prohibits only the higher explosives, but will let the "makings" go out on every ship every day to the belligerent nations?

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. But that is not the case.

Mr. PATRICK. It is not the case?

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. It is not the case.

Mr. PATRICK. Does not the gentleman concede that under the present embargo all the "makings" not only can be but are being sent to the warring nations every day now?

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. What does the gentleman mean by the term "makings"?

Mr. PATRICK. What, indeed, do I mean by the "makings"? Did not the gentleman state that he is in a manufacturing district?

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. PATRICK. Take, for example, ore, and the present embargo does not prevent the sending of oil and petroleum to the warring nations.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. PATRICK. And it does not prevent any of the fundamentals from which higher explosives are made from being sent to Europe right now.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Surely.

Mr. PATRICK. And under the present Embargo Act, is not our Nation sending this stuff right over into the heart of the warring zone now?

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. That is right; and it is not endangering our boys, because there is no temptation for Germany to send a force here to stop those raw materials at the source.

You will never find an explosion, you will never hear of a bombing of a grain elevator or of an oil tank, for instance, but when you manufacture munitions of war and get that ready to be used immediately by the fighting forces in the field, and attempt to furnish that kind of support to one side or the other, then you immediately invite retaliation and an attempt to stop the flow of that type of munitions.

Mr. PATRICK. How in the name of heaven does the gentleman stand there and say that we will never hear of the sinking of a ship that has tanks of oil or food or medicines—

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Oh, let us not shift the basis.

Mr. PATRICK. We are not shifting the basis.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Yes; you are shifting the basis. Shipping is a totally different thing.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. In the course of the gentleman's scholarly and most eloquent summary of our situation, the gentleman performed a great contribution to the thinking of this Nation in summing the laws of other countries, which show that the arms embargo, far from being an unusual arrangement, is a means that practically every nation has used to keep out of war.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. That is correct.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Does the gentleman remember that last summer and even this fall we have been told by high officials, and the public has been told, that we were the only nation that had such a law, and we have been led to believe that we were trying some noble experiment that had never been tried anywhere else.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. That is akin to the kind of false and misleading propaganda that we are being continually subjected to in this country, designed to draw us into war.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK], if I understood him correctly, made the argument, in substance, that unless we repealed this embargo, our factories would move out of the country. I am right about that matter, am I not, Mr. PATRICK?

Mr. PATRICK. I think the gentleman will certainly concede that it has that tendency.

Mr. HOFFMAN. So you are willing to gamble on our chance of getting into war, to keep our factories running, so that we will get a profit?

Mr. PATRICK. No! No! That is not the same proposition.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does not the gentleman recall that the President in his message to this special session said that by proclamation now those ships could be put on the basis of cash and carry, or made to sail at their own risk?

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And if those ships carrying contraband or semicontraband now are a menace to the peace and safety of this country, today they could be put on their own risk by proclamation of the President?

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. That is correct.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I was interested in the colloquy between the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK]. I was surprised to see in the RECORD where the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] had asserted that the allied nations had been unable to get munitions and implements of war but that we had been supplying during the years the totalitarian governments with supplies. I think the RECORD ought to be cleared on that point, so I have looked up the figures. I think the gentleman from Alabama will be interested in them. Of the articles now under embargo supplied to Germany by the United States during the 8-month period from January 1 to September 1, 1939, Germany purchased \$22,665 worth; England, \$21,159,428 worth.

In another period, December 31, 1937, to November 30, 1938, Germany purchased \$139,664; France, \$6,446,849; and England, \$29,611,797.

Now, the people of this country cannot think straight when that sort of misinformation is sent out over the radio and is put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Any person who wants to get the facts can call up the Munitions Board and get them. This thing ought to be stopped.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER. Not to pick on the good nature of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK], the gentleman has reiterated several times that our law permits the shipping of "the makings," as he terms it. I suggest that the gentleman read the embargo restrictions that are now in force, and he will find that most of the so-called makings of munitions are now included in the embargo. If they are not—if such things as, to use the President's own example, copper tubing are not included—they certainly can be, under the wording of our present neutrality law, which allows the President to embargo not only munitions but implements of war, and carries the additional wording "materials of like kind." I think any reasonable interpretation of that act would tell you that 6-inch copper tubing is material of like kind to a copper shell.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. PATRICK. The gentleman will concede, also, that if we are going into that phase of it, it will open the whole subject, because what about cotton, kerosene oil, and even foods and medicines, that are more important in the daily carrying on of a war than high explosives of any kind as far as hour-by-hour activities are concerned?

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield for me to answer his question?

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER. To answer the gentleman's question, I challenge you to show me any correspondence taking place between our State Department and any foreign government between 1914 and 1917 that created any controversy that referred to anything listed by the gentleman; and, as a matter of fact, you will find that every controversy arose over the shipping or the sinking or the dealing in arms, munitions, and implements of war. There was not an acute situation developed because of oil or medical supplies or articles of similar nature.

Mr. PATRICK. But the facts are that a nation announces what it considers contraband. Can we stand up here and assume to determine what is the most bitterly contested matter—contraband in Germany, France, and England?

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. If the question is addressed to me, I will answer the gentleman.

Mr. PATRICK. It is primarily, of course.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. We have the experience of the years from 1915 to 1917 to guide us. It is just as the gentleman from Connecticut has said—the things that induce the

bombings, the explosions, acts of sabotage, and destruction in this country are not what he calls the "makings," but actual implements of war. I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HAWKS. I would just like to reply to the gentleman from New York on the matter of the mass of misinformation that has been handed out during the past weeks. A mass of misinformation that would tend to confuse anybody and certainly has confused the Congress has been handed out, but I say to the gentleman from New York emphatically that it has not confused the American people. The overwhelming demand on the Congress of the United States from the people back home is to keep the arms embargo, and the gentleman cannot deny it. [Applause.]

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. That is right. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker:

Hon. CHARLES L. GIFFORD, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As our Representative in Congress we not only urge but demand that you vote to sustain and retain our present neutrality law. No cash and carry, which in our opinion is first step toward getting United States into war.

Yours truly,

How many have you received of similar nature? Yet in the debates in the Senate and House there has been practical agreement on the cash-and-carry provision.

Mr. Speaker, my remarks, I trust, will be primarily provocative. I asked for 40 minutes that I might share the time with my colleagues. I want them to help resolve my own doubts. I have dismissed politics, which is, as you know, somewhat against my usual custom. [Laughter.] Conscience will certainly be my guide.

A very interesting and voluminous scrapbook entirely on the subject of neutrality has been prepared by me, while I have been vacationing in Washington. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, certainly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Some of us have not been vacationing here.

Mr. GIFFORD. I trust that the ironical statements I make here will be regarded as such.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GIFFORD. Certainly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That was not ironical, that was for the information of the gentleman.

Mr. GIFFORD. If there is any way that I can arrive at the truth in this House it is to say a thing in some way that will convey a meaning which may be deliberately misleading. I do not intend to disclose my real attitude, at present.

Neutrality! Against whom? In this apt phrase has neutrality become clearly defined by both sides in the present controversy; painful evidence that no written law can achieve strict impartiality.

Pointedly is this question presented: Shall we not then favor our friends? Can we continue to prate in favor of democratic forms of government as immeasurably to be preferred to the totalitarian ideology without giving at least some concrete expression of our sympathy? How far shall we withdraw ourselves into the cave of hoped-for security? What cause seems to us to be the more righteous? We know the answer plainly in the hearts of the American people. But they want to be kept out of war. We are united in this Nation in our determination to keep out of this European war. Not one drop of blood shall be shed by our boys on Europe's soil. The past experiences have influenced us in this decision. We are insistent that we shall keep our boys out of the Old World's wars.

But shall we render any sort of assistance to those whom we regard as now fighting for the preservation of ideals akin

to our own? Not one drop of our blood shall be shed; but what about our pile of gold?

Many have assumed that the struggle is simply to obtain or retain power; that it is a matter only of power politics. Well, Russia and Germany are, indeed, dividing the spoils of conquest. We are also reminded of the ancient wrongs perpetrated by certain of the so-called democratic nations in their former policies of aggression and empire building. A recital of our own Nation's earlier aggressions in wresting the land from the Indians is not altogether pleasant to hear. I would not like to grate upon your nerves by describing some of our own former wars.

The little boy was asked how many wars of aggression has the United States indulged in?

"Six."

"Name them."

"One, two, three, four, five, six." [Laughter.]

The illustration is sufficient.

The map of Europe has changed with incredible swiftness. Now, however, the world is concerned with the present situation and the motives behind it. It is argued that the past may be a guide. Arguments of the past are not entirely persuasive. Willingly, not grudgingly, we will relinquish our proud insistence of former days on the freedom of the seas.

War profits be damned.

I hope that is expressive enough without argument. No legislator here can be influenced by that argument, none so motivated in his attitude; and yet I hear over the radio, and see in the press, and hear from other sources that great influences are being brought to bear by munitions makers to get us into this war. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] disposed of that completely. Have you had any influence exerted upon you by anybody who wants to get us into war for the sake of profits? I think not. Has any Congressman here been influenced in the slightest degree from that standpoint? Certainly not. Then why the ravings of important personages in order to bolster up the stand which they have taken in this controversy? But are we unable to assert and maintain any rights in our own areas of ownership and peaceful operation? Shall we entirely abandon such rights? Are we still a great and glorious Nation?

Shall we not insist that actual warfare shall not be waged by foreign belligerents within actual American zones? Proclamations to that effect have already been made by the President. The Navy has been ordered to carry them out. Shall we expect incidents similar to that of the *City of Flint*, perhaps, in the near future? Shall we further attempt to define territorial waters? Shall the Panama agreement be approved and our Navy obligated to enforce its provisions throughout that great area? Will not incidents flowing from such an insistence on our just national rights and from their responsibilities created by the Monroe Doctrine, recently extended to Canada, a Canada which is even now a belligerent, be far more provocative of war than any mere sales or credit? They do not now need our ammunition and our guns. They have not been buying them, while the aggressor nations have been manufacturing them and making great preparations for war. When the other nations, the victims of such preparations, want help, even though friends of ours, shall we withhold assistance? My conscience disturbs me. Oh, astonishing indeed are some of the partnerships of opinion created by this issue. Former estrangements are now reconciled into common action. Here politics are put aside in this grave period, and to the great advantage, it would seem, of the dominant party. Be not deceived when domestic policies are represented at the regular session of the Congress. The purest form of patriotism will be opposition by the minority to further experimentations that have brought us to the very brink of financial chaos. If I make a sincere statement and it does not agree with your opinion, I know how prone you of the majority are to challenge it; perhaps even in such an important matter as this. To illustrate the point, a pleasantry might be in order. "Grandma, I am 20 years old. Will you advise me how to get a good husband?" "You let husbands alone. Pick a single man."

No matter how sincere one may be, it is astonishing how such a different construction may be put on one's remarks.

Yes; I am still somewhat undecided. I have promised to make no irrevocable statements. I have no desire to assume leadership and try to win followers. I have listened to the ravings of the man who has made up his mind too early and then uses all his ingenuity to try to bolster his argument, whistling loudly to keep up his own courage. He may tell us the munition makers "will get us if we don't watch out." He tries to frighten people with extraordinary statements.

I am sorry for that man who will make up his mind before all the arguments have been presented and without regard to events which may subsequently occur. "Neutrality." That is a rather remarkable word; neither one thing nor another. What a position in which to be placed. In order for us to be genuinely neutral we must assume both parties to the conflict to be either equally guilty or equally not guilty. To save our own material welfare we are to do nothing. In any event, our blood will not be shed on the battlefields of Europe. There is no need for that, and it is not going to be permitted. To our distressed friends to whom we have given credit in times of peace and with whom we have sought to be good neighbors, and from whom we have solicited trade, we now say, "Cash on the barrel head." Cash in what form?

I will ask you to read that thoughtful speech of the able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]. I have it here. Gold? You want gold. You want nothing else. A Senator has recently asked the Treasury, "What will be the effect of taking more gold on our own economy?" It is fool's gold, but not the kind of fool's gold you have heard here referred to so many times during the last day or two—the fool's gold you call profits. This is an added surplus of gold, of which we have more than we need or can use, gold that may be the root of much evil. Gold is confiscated, certificates issued against it, and then both counted as assets. If the reverse process does not soon prevail and we do not cancel the certificates and give back the gold, I fear for the future financial results to this Nation. If all the countries give us all their gold, then it is worthless as a commodity. Bryan is often quoted, in effect, "Furnish money, and that buys everything." But the man in the desert or cut off from opportunity to use the gold which he may have will starve to death. He cannot eat gold. If other nations are eventually forced to abandon gold as a standard of value, our own horde of it will be worthless indeed.

I have spoken to many audiences recently. I offered to address a number of high schools. Boys and girls of 16 to 18 are writing in to us and are eager to be informed on this vital subject. I presented both sides of the argument as impartially as I could, so that they might talk the matter over with their fathers and mothers perhaps more intelligently. I had several audiences to which I declared that I would not disclose my own attitude but would rather present both sides of the question. I said, "If anyone amongst you will come to me afterward and tell me how I ought to vote I shall welcome his suggestion." Almost unanimous was the response. "You have a difficult problem to decide." One editor writes me, "I know you will think it over carefully. Whatever you decide will be satisfactory to me." He lives on an island in the sea and represents a people unafraid.

My own personal friends are not bombarding me with demands regarding my vote on this matter. They are not writing "do this" or "do that." The size of the pile of letters has but little to do with a decision if the great majority of the writers are merely carrying out the dictates of some other person. I do feel that most of my constituents trust me in this matter. The great majority cannot be influenced by the appeals of the fanatically minded. They are competent to weigh both sides of an issue and can understand the necessity of a carefully considered decision on the part of their representative in the Congress.

If ever I voted according to my conscience it will be now. I greatly regret that it has happened that men leaning to a certain decision have been asked, "Are you willing to offer yourself in the event of war? Have you an eligible son?"

Is it possible, as I read in the newspapers, that there is a Congressman making a poll to find out who here have sons that might be required to go to war, that a Member's vote and his patriotism might otherwise be questioned? In this Nation of ours, after adoption of the draft system, only the accident of age or of physical ability are the determining factors. Let no one assume to himself more patriotism than that possessed by his fellow members. We must all take our medicine, no matter how bitter. Forced service requires the same sacrifice and suffering as volunteer service, should war actually come, which God forbid. I regret that it should be a challenge to any man standing on this floor that he may be voting what are presumably his honest convictions as a result of cowardice or some other motivating influence. It does not matter on which side of this issue we vote in one respect. It is certain that we are not going to war in Europe. You have without doubt already pledged yourselves to your constituents on that point.

I listened to a great Senator who opened the discussion on the radio: "If we remove the embargo it is intervention, it is the first step. The next step is credit. The next step is sending your boys to Europe." When a Senator made up his mind 20 long years ago, it may be hard for him to change it. However, I am forced to consider, "Why did he want us to recognize Russia, a nation that had declared world revolution and unloosed Communists even in these United States?" Consistency! I declare consistency to be, as Emerson put it, only "a virtue of small minds." In July I was paired to keep the embargo on arms. Perhaps I should have listened to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON]. Perhaps I ought to have harkened to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

I did, indeed, listen, and with very great concern. I voted against them. Why did I do it? Of course, I did it thinking that if we gave notice beforehand that we would not furnish arms, other nations would not go to war. That explains my attitude at the time. Useless. They went to war. It did not apparently deter them at all. Therefore the necessity now arises either to renew or to change my decision. "Did I vote right? It did not keep them out of war." Now I must carefully weigh a decision, so soon to be required on the same issue.

Neutrality? Oh, the legal aspect of it. International law? The legal aspect of it. What is international law today? Does it permit that after a war starts, one nation, only recently hating another one, should immediately make friends with it in order to divide up the spoils between them? Oh, Russia is still legally neutral. How ridiculous. She chose deliberately whom she would assist, even when war against Poland was being waged. She is furnishing an immense amount of goods in months to come to assist the German people and she has bartered for it. Not "cash on the barrel." Why cannot we likewise barter if we deem it wise to do so? No; we want cash on the barrel. As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] says, "Barter simply cannot be considered." Dismiss the idea. It has to be cash. You may answer me and say, "Ah, but our potential debtors own securities over here which they can convert into cash. That will last for some little time. They have prepared themselves, of course, in that respect." That may be the answer for the present. But what effect on our economy if they dump our securities? You say you want gold on the barrel. That gold must first go to the Federal Reserve, then to the Treasury, certificates must be issued, and then the Federal Reserve banks will issue notes, and they will finally have the cash. It must all be done previous to delivery. Drafts and checks must be certified.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If I understood the gentleman correctly, the gentleman asked us why we want cash. Let me ask the gentleman, Would he trust a debtor who owed him and would not pay?

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, I have done that often.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman do it voluntarily?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is the gentleman still financially responsible?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then, does the gentleman have some magic that no one else has?

Mr. GIFFORD. I will state to the gentleman that I was once in the grocery business.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That may be an Eddie Cantor answer, but it is not an answer to the question I asked.

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, yes. People owed me a lot of money. They have said nothing about it since. Some are now in good financial circumstances.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then the gentleman is out of the grocery business now, as I understand.

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Maybe that is the reason.

Mr. GIFFORD. That is undoubtedly the reason.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want our country to continue in business and not finance other nations.

Mr. GIFFORD. If there is one thing in this world I can truthfully say, it is that I love my fellow man, even though he may be a debtor. He is still generally my friend. That fault does not matter to me at all. [Applause.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have been following the gentleman's remarks as best I can.

Mr. GIFFORD. I know it is difficult. They have been very disjoined. Perhaps I should have written a speech from this material and here read it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would rather have it this way. Does the gentleman believe that we should sell such goods as we do sell to Britain and France on credit terms? In other words, I am trying to clear up in my own mind whether or not at least a part of the gentleman's presentation is to the effect that we should open credit terms to the belligerent countries.

Mr. GIFFORD. I would say to the gentleman that that is a question I cannot answer. I ironically stated it the way I did—"shall we now, when they are distressed, not give them any credit as we would have done when they were prosperous?" I asked that question, and I am myself wrestling with that problem. I will simply state to you gentlemen that my conscience is at work, with no positive answer as yet. I am making this speech so that you may perhaps resolve my doubts for me.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Did I understand the gentleman also to say, in substance, that he felt it would be a sound program for us to follow not only to sell Britain and France, but also Germany and the other countries as well?

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, I suppose the answer I might make is this: Canada has declared war. If a battleship attacked Canada, where would we be? We are already pledged to protect her. Would we grant her credits? Of course we would. Everybody seems willing to send their boys not to fight abroad but to maintain the Monroe Doctrine. And we have embraced the whole of the Americas now. Often have I stated that the danger or the mischief in our future foreign policy lies there. Why did we adopt it? We seem to have given guaranties to friendly, and perhaps unfriendly, peoples on this hemisphere, lest our material safety or interests be adversely affected.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman from Massachusetts has developed my thought on this proposition of cash and carry just as well as I could have developed it myself, tying it into the Canadian situation and into the gold situation, because I see no way on earth how paying us gold for these goods would do us any good. I think it would do us harm. With Canada as a belligerent, we are pledged to protect them, and that erases from my mind the question of cash so far as Canada is concerned.

Mr. GIFFORD. And when Canada gets into trouble many people may have to eat their own words.

To my audiences of large numbers I yielded much time for questioning. I wish to present some of these to you: "Have you read the Borah speech?" I replied, of course, along the lines already suggested in these remarks.

"Did you listen to the Lindbergh speech?" I did; but he merely said, in effect, "Keep out of foreign entanglements; keep out of Europe." Nevertheless, he did not mention in his first speech any of the real problems involved in the bill that is now before the Congress.

"Did you listen to or read his second speech?" Yes; I read it, and I should dismiss it by saying, "Let his mother-in-law and Dorothy Thompson take care of the boy." [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Now, do not get greatly stirred up by another ironical statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I am not stirred up; I am amused. I am always amused when the gentleman talks. But I want to ask the gentleman about something entirely different, and that is this: I understood the gentleman to say—perhaps I was wrong—we should aid Britain and France. If I was correct in assuming that, will the gentleman tell us whether we should help them all along the line, beginning with furnishing munitions of war, money, and credit, and then down to ships and men, or how far should we go?

Mr. GIFFORD. I will say to the gentleman, as I did at the outset, I do not say and I did not say that we should aid France and England. I said my conscience was working, and I am still seriously debating with myself as to whether we should grant any moral or material assistance to them. Many arguments have been made here about this neutrality law, and more on one side than on the other. I am trying to look at both sides of this question, and I am willing to debate either side, because an answer seems to be available to support or to refute every opinion which has been presented.

"Did you listen to Al Smith?" Yes; and whether I agreed with him or not, it was a remarkably patriotic speech. I would like to enlarge upon that, but shall not at this time. It would delve into the realms of politics.

Two of the speeches on this floor brought me to an extremely thoughtful mental attitude. My emotions were aroused to an extent which I can hardly express. I have them here. I have read and reread them. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] pointed out to us so carefully that we should be governed by the lessons of the last war. Certainly, to a certain point, we should. Then they portrayed by word picture the horrors of war, and showed to us that: "We must not have any of it. Take no steps, if there is even a doubt that that step might lead us into war."

Clergymen plead with their congregations, "America must not sell guns to kill people. That is a moral wrong." As I say, there is always the answer: "Let distressed and hard-pressed friends die as martyrs. God will take care of them." Nevertheless that argument is very persuasive. It greatly disturbs me. I have listened to this: "If there are two men fighting in the highway, keep away." "Yes, but they may be friends. It might be my son. He may be fighting a bandit. They are fighting on the highway where I must go to work. I must attend the marriage or funeral of my daughter. I must go through." "No, keep away, lest it might get us all in."

His daughter married an Englishman. He thought it was a good alliance—one with a cultured gentleman. Now he wants to go over there, if some emergency should arise. But we are not now to say simply, as we have heretofore done, "You can go on a belligerent ship at your own risk." No. We are even proposing to fine him if he goes at his own risk, lest he get us into some sort of entanglement.

You must have read Walter Lippmann in his column of yesterday.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. Did the gentleman hear Senator HIRAM JOHNSON, of California, discuss this neutrality legislation?

Mr. GIFFORD. I did not hear it. I read it. It was a great speech. Senator VANDENBERG's speech was a great speech. But what has oratory got to do with this? I am not indulging in that. I am making a provocative, disjointed speech on purpose. I might make a decision and bolster it with all kinds of arguments as they did—not so good, perhaps. I am not a candidate for President of the United States. I am not an isolationist. Having made up my mind 20 years ago, I cannot go back. [Laughter.]

Oh, some of us may regret that we did not listen to what the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] had to say, in effect, here only last June:

I believe we can use our best judgment when we see exactly what is facing us, but I suggest that we cannot use accurate judgment with respect to the unpredictable, and that is what these neutrality acts invite us to do.

He urged us to withhold judgment at that time. Why did you not follow him over there in the majority side? You listened to him. You trooped in to hear him, but you, in the main, voted against his advice. A majority of you did. The minority side largely voted to keep the embargo, but with your tremendous majority you decided against him. So many of you have now to retrace your steps and change your minds. Why? For the same reasons as many others. I forgive you for it, of course. We acted hastily perhaps, but we meant well. It did not work. Oh, consistency! We do not want to have small minds.

I was interested in another remarkable speech on the foreign debt. First, let me tell you I was in an audience not long ago where an Englishman of culture and education said:

England is not in immediate danger. But we love liberty. We are willing to make enormous sacrifices to preserve liberty in the world. And we expect America to do exactly as she did before.

A certain Senator recently stated, "They owe us this money. Let us now take their possessions in the West Indies for debts." One moment a peaceful man, the next, urging the worst form of aggression—to wrest a country away from them while they are in distress. Marvelous. But I could not refrain from smiling because I have here so often contrasted our own public debts. I have said that England had a public debt of such great proportions because she had colonial possessions that were really worth a vast sum of money, and she could perhaps even wipe out her debt by selling one of her important possessions. They were the reasons for her public debt. I am glad of such recognition of this fact.

I cannot seem to find in my files here the argument of Walter Lippmann of yesterday. I wish you would read it, however. It was printed in the Washington Post of yesterday morning. Sometimes, you know, he is most persuasive. Especially when he reminds us of our greatness, and queries, in effect, whether we shall sink into degeneracy by going into a cave and pulling the cave in after us?

I have copies of the amendments adopted in another body to the bill on yesterday. We seem now to be emerging from that cave.

They now realize how foolish we were in trying to get so far in the cave. I am gratified at this action. New England went through the embargo of Jefferson in 1807. She did not like it. Did it keep us out of war? We were in the war plenty in 1812 as a result of that embargo.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does not the gentleman believe that a great many people in this country were switched away from their loyalty to an embargo law to the cash-and-carry idea because they felt that the latter would take our ships off the seas and keep them out of so-called war waters or war zones?

Mr. GIFFORD. I should think that would be a fair statement of the case.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If that were true to a material extent, to the extent of a million of voters, what would be the reaction of these voters so influenced when they came to find out that the final bill, if it does carry such provisions, will permit our ships to go into war zones, to sail the seas, and to run the risks they understood would not be taken by our people if embargo were repealed and cash and carry adopted?

Mr. GIFFORD. As I understand it, other parts of the bill will amply provide that our ships cannot go into so-called actual war zones.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me ask the gentleman, Does he understand that the Senate bill is likely to permit our ships to service Canadian ports, Pacific and Atlantic?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; but they cut out Halifax, which is an ocean port. They are trying to be reasonable.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do I understand the gentleman to assume that the Senate bill will permit our ships to go into Asiatic waters?

Mr. GIFFORD. I do.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then if our ships go into Canadian ports and service Asiatic waters, it is my very frank and firm opinion that those people who were led to believe that the substitution of cash and carry for embargo will have been very much double-crossed.

Mr. GIFFORD. That is fashionable. Russia double-crossed Britain. We may expect a triple-cross against Germany. I agree with the gentleman that the people are not fully informed. They may feel that they have been double-crossed. Rantings over the radio have raised some havoc. Many people feel that they do not need to know, because they can repeat what others think they know.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But if the gentleman will yield further?

Mr. GIFFORD. Certainly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Here was a situation where our people had their ears attuned to what was about to be settled. Our people knew nothing about the technicalities of embargo, they knew nothing about this gold situation. I am talking about the man out on the farm, the man down in the valley, the man on the streets and in the counting rooms. Our people do not understand the situation. I think I can say with truthfulness that Members of the other body and the Members of this House do not understand the situation. This is evident from what has been said by those who have spoken since. They were sold an idea, namely: Forget the embargo proposition and accept cash and carry, for in this procedure our ships are taken off the seas and there is no chance of our becoming involved. I am talking about what we may do as representatives of the people in the way of double-crossing them and not what Russia or Germany did to each other, or what some foreign country did to another foreign country. I am talking about us as representatives of the people.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Massachusetts may be extended for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COFFEE of Washington). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. I understand the gentleman, but do not forget that nations at war double-cross to the extent that reverberations of such double-crossing may be heard around the world. It is at least worthy of some attention. Unexpected developments are already having their repercussions.

He walked into the watchmaker's and said: "You sold me a watch that you said would last me the rest of my life."

"Yes; but you looked pretty sick yesterday." [Laughter.] Things indeed looked very different yesterday.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. PATRICK. I want exactly to understand the full basis for this last colloquy between the gentleman from Michigan

and the gentleman from Massachusetts. I do not know what the gentleman from Michigan has in his mind.

Mr. GIFFORD. Do not take my time, please. I will tell the gentleman what it is. Cash and carry—come and get it with your ships, not our ships. Right here I have a copy of an amendment which permits our ships to go into zones that are at least somewhat dangerous. Our ships are not going off the seas. I agree with our Pacific friends that it is ridiculous not to have the privilege of sending our ships from Seattle to Vancouver. By the same token it is ridiculous that we in New England cannot send the ships from Eastport, Maine, to New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, or Newfoundland.

Mr. THORKELOSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, there has never been any pretense that such section should be enforced, except in the zone of actual belligerent operations.

Mr. GIFFORD. Of course. But a wave of oratory has been flooding the country: We will take our ships off the seas. We are willing to make huge sacrifices for peace. We will not send our ships into danger zones. Now we are relaxing that, and I agree with it. I do not fear the result.

Mr. THORKELOSON. What will be the line of demarcation between what is a danger zone and what is not a danger zone?

Mr. GIFFORD. It will be provided that our ships may travel to ports in Canada, but not Halifax, it being an ocean port. They will try to define as best they can safe and unsafe zones, and somewhere in the bill authority will be given to the President to change and to regulate as he may deem wise.

And that is or has been the real worry to many of us. I have divorced myself from that. It took quite an effort. I have been greatly disturbed by the assertions made by our President. I listened to that radio address in which he assured us and reassured us that he would see to it that this country was kept out of war. While many have told me we cannot trust our President because he has already stated his attitude, I can only reply, as I have said many times before, "He is the only President I have."

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman understand that the Senate bill is likely to provide that our ships may also enter Dutch ports?

Mr. GIFFORD. I am very doubtful about that. There was an amendment offered to the effect that we draw a line around Europe, Great Britain, and Ireland, 300 miles out at sea, and that no ship of ours could travel in that zone.

Again neutrality.

Is Italy neutral? Is Russia neutral? I ask that question. They are, under a strict definition of the law, and do you want us to follow such strict definitions in view of the trickery or the double-crossing, or the situation as it may eventuate? No; my conscience rebels at that legal definition of neutrality which may cover such action. Our neutrality covered us in our relations with Japan. We can still be honorable if we try to meet the exigencies as they arise. Do not make up your minds on one viewpoint only and clinch it with all the oratory at your command. As for me, I am still much in doubt, after listening to all those able men on both sides. There is one thing I am sure of because I feel that I know. Congress will not get America into a war that will send boys to Europe. And I may assert that this is still a great and glorious Nation.

I represent a constituency here, but far more than that I represent a great Nation. I fully believe that at this hour I should not go into the cave and pull the cave in after me. I should still be willing to assert certain traditional rights which belong to us. We would actually be cowards if we completely deserted those rights. Some voices urge that when it is all over, and the other so-called democracies perhaps destroyed, ours would be the only great free Nation that can preserve and succor the world. I do not wish to have this country stand alone against all the world.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. As far as it is humanly possible to know what is in the future, I feel I know, and the gentleman states he knows, that we will not become involved

in this war. My first and prime consideration is, What course will keep us out of this war?

Mr. GIFFORD. Are not our pledges good for anything? Has not practically every man pledged his constituency that he would vote against sending our boys into a war in Europe?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I hope the gentleman and I are both right in respect to that part of our future. If keeping our present law as it is will best keep us out of war, I am for that. If modifying our present law will best keep us out of war, I am for that.

Mr. GIFFORD. We must believe our colleagues. They probably have pledged it. We are going to keep the President himself out of war. He is not going to keep us out. We shall keep him out.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I agree with the gentleman that Congress should keep the President—any President—out of war. The gentleman said a moment ago something about our being pledged to come to the defense of Canada in case that country is attacked. Does he have any reference to any act of Congress or any treaty to that effect?

Mr. GIFFORD. No. I have reference to the President's promise which we must make good and I have reference to every man who believes in the Monroe Doctrine. It applies just as much to Canada as it does to the other countries, in spirit and probably in fact. The Monroe Doctrine was a unilateral document not long ago. We alone so declared and we could have abandoned that pledge. Some 3 years ago we went down into the southern hemisphere and induced the nations there all to agree to it. Now it is a multilateral agreement, and we cannot withdraw from it. We hear that Brazil speaks of the United States Navy as "our navy." We are tied to an agreement that contains much potential trouble.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Does not the history of the last World War and its aftermath show that Europe may be deceived as to what America will do, or may do, or may not do, on the promise of one man? Is it not true that Woodrow Wilson apparently led Europe to believe he was the spokesman for this Nation, but finally the promise did not materialize because the Senate, the constitutional body authorized to act on treaties and such international matters, thought otherwise and did not back him up? Europeans should study our constitutional system before counting too much upon a great leader's promises. If any legislation is passed by this body soon giving any nation or nations now at war any indirect advantage, that is certainly no reason to believe that we will go to war for the further benefit of that nation or those nations.

Mr. GIFFORD. I really do not think England relies too much on us, although we vigorously express our devotion to democratic ideals. During the Revolutionary War we were suppliants asking assistance everywhere to help us establish freedom.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short statement from an editorial in the Saturday Evening Post of this week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COFFEE of Washington). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter received by me from Dr. Gallup, of the American Institute of Public Opinion, my reply to him, together with certain comments and papers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief article by the newspaper publisher, Frank E. Gannett; also a

small article in the form of a speech given by J. Edgar Hoover on October 25.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a special order previously entered, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKEKELSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

NEUTRALITY

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the remarks of the preceding speaker this afternoon, and I hope with him that we will not become involved in war.

There seems to be considerable confusion about neutrality. I have inserted remarks in the RECORD discussing neutrality as I understand it, and there is an article in the RECORD of the 23d of this month dealing with the same problem. We have a perfect right to consider neutrality and embargoes from our own viewpoint, but we have no right to enforce our viewpoint on powers at war.

One of our ships was captured recently by a German submarine or war craft, and this ship is now in a Russian port. What is the angle of that? We have no complaint to make whatever. The ship carried contraband. The ship was captured and it is now in a harbor of Russia. The question that comes up in this particular case is whether Russia is at war with the United States or is lined up with Germany. If Russia is neutral she must intern the German crew and send the American crew back aboard the ship and send the ship out. If Russia is not neutral, then she will keep the ship in port, and might send the American crew back.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman hold that Russia is neutral now?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I do not know. There are a lot of angles to this thing. Here is a possibility—and, mind you, this is my own opinion. It is quite possible that Germany sent this ship into Russia on purpose, because if Russia holds the ship it means that Russia is lined up with Germany, whereas if Russia sends the ship out and holds the German crew it would mean that she is not lined up with Germany. That might be the angle. I do not know.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. According to the American position, taken by our New Deal President, Russia is neutral. If the administration has held that Russia is not neutral, the President would have had to put in force the arms embargo against shipment of munitions and implements of war to Russia. He has failed to do this, notwithstanding the fact that Russia invaded Poland in practically the same manner as Germany did.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I might call the attention of the gentleman to this little article appearing in today's Washington Times-Herald:

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt warned today that in suppressing alien-controlled groups we also suppress some of our own freedom.

Speaking at the opening session of the New York Herald Tribune forum on current events, Mrs. Roosevelt said it was very important when we know that alien-controlled groups are doing harm and to try to counteract their influence.

She evidently approves of alien and communistic groups and feels that we should not hurt them.

A short while ago I wanted to insert in the RECORD the names of persons who are connected with the American League for Peace and Democracy. This is a communistic organization, and I think the names of the members ought to be before the American public. However, someone objected to it. Now, I can only assume that those who objected to it must themselves be in sympathy with subversive movements. That is why they objected to it.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. GEYER of California, and Mr. PATRICK rose.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is talking about subversive activities. Certainly the gentleman has recently been the white-haired boy of one organization that is pretty subversive.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Will the gentleman state which organization?

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. The gentleman knows.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. No; the gentleman does not know. The gentleman accuses me of being a member of an organization. I want the gentleman to state it publicly.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is familiar with the publication which most of the Members of Congress receive, in which he is quoted and referred to every week.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I am quoted in every column in the papers, I am quoted in the Coffee Cup, I am quoted by the Merry-Go-Round, and I am quoted by every communistic paper in the world.

Mr. COCHRAN rose.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Just a moment. I want this gentleman to answer this question. Please state the name of the organization to which you refer.

Mr. PATRICK. In other words, the gentleman is getting plenty of publicity now.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Yes. I want some more.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. I am talking about the Pelley publication.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. All right; is that an organization?

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I want the gentleman to know that there is only one organization of which I am a member and that is the United States Naval Reserve.

I know that every man who is a member of a communistic organization is not a Communist. I know that, but I know a lot of them are deceived and become members because they do not know what is actually behind the organization, and that is what I am talking about.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I notice in the gentleman's list brought out by the Dies committee that the real New Deal Secretary of Agriculture, Mordecai Ezekiel, is on that list. In fairness to the members whose names appear on that list and in fairness to the people of America, should not the Dies committee call each and every one of them, swear them, and find out whether they now belong or ever have belonged to the Communist created, dominated, and controlled American League for Peace and Democracy?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I want to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that this list is a list of men working in the Federal Government who are members of this league, and I think the people of the United States ought to know about that.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GEYER of California. The gentleman has stated that this is a communistic organization. I would like to have him bring forth some evidence here to prove that this organization is communistic. Simply because they have some members—and I understand the Republican Party has some also who are members of the Communist Party—does not mean that the organization itself is communistic, and will the gentleman give us some information on this point?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right on that point?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I want to make this statement. I do not wish to accuse all the members of being Communists, but it is the principle upon which all of these organizations are organized that is un-American. Now, remember this: We have just one document in this country, and that is the Constitution of the United States, and if anyone advocates anything that is contrary to that document he becomes a

Communist right then, and that is what this organization advocates.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I yield.

Mr. PATRICK. Would the gentleman say that, by that same token, he is a member of the Silver Shirts? Does the gentleman think he is a member of the Silver Shirts?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Let me tell you a little story about the Silver Shirts.

Mr. PATRICK. If that is true, the gentleman acknowledges himself that he is a member of the Silver Shirts?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Just a minute. I will answer you. I am having a lot of fun now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Let me tell you a little story first. When I was home this summer I had a telephone call from Missoula and they asked me to come up and speak to them about subversive activities. When I stepped out of the car two of them asked me to accompany them into a private office. There were 10 people in this group, men and women. I think they were between 50 and 60 years old. I said, "Why do you close the doors?" They said, "Well, we do not know who might hear us." I said, "What are we going to talk about?" They said, "Well, we want to find out something about this communism." I said, "What do you people believe in?" They said, "Well, we do not believe in communism. We do not understand all this stuff."

I said, "What are you people?" They said, "We belong to the Silver Shirts." That was the first time I ever saw any of those people in my life. I said, "Have the people of the United States reached the point where they must now meet in a room and barricade themselves to talk about constitutional government? Have the people of the United States reached the point where patriotic citizens must barricade themselves in order to talk about the skunks that are destroying this Government? Have we reached that point?" I did not know those people, but it appeared tragic to me that 10 mature Americans who believed in the fundamental principles of our Government, and who were interested in finding out and being informed about communism would barricade themselves in a room with closed doors and windows to discuss constitutional government. I belong to one organization, and if the United States gets into trouble I will be resigning right here to go with it. That is the United States Navy. That is the organization I belong to, and nothing else, and I want you to know I am very proud of it. [Applause.]

Mr. PATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

There was nobody in there but the Silver Shirts and the gentleman himself? Nobody else was there?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Ten citizens of Montana. I do not know what a Silver Shirt is.

Mr. PATRICK. Did you not state they called themselves Silver Shirts?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Now you are talking about something. Will you tell me what a Silver Shirt is?

Mr. PATRICK. I am not as well informed on that as the gentleman is.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Then why do you not become informed before you ask questions? [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. PATRICK. I would like to have the information from an authority like the gentleman.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. You are the best authority that I know.

Mr. PATRICK. Will the gentleman be willing to go on the floor—

Mr. THORKEKELSON. With you at any time.

Mr. PATRICK. And denounce the Silver Shirts as he does the Communists? Does the gentleman take the same position on this floor toward the Silver Shirts and Pelleyites that he does toward the Communists?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Now sit down. [Laughter.]

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman include the Ku Klux Klan for the benefit of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. THORKELSON. Will the gentleman take one position?

Mr. PATRICK. I am in a sitting position now. [Laughter.]

Mr. THORKELSON. I believe in the principles of our American Government. I have stated that I class communism, nazi-ism, Ku Klux Klanism, and all "isms" in the same group.

I have always believed in the fundamental principles of this Republic. I cannot support any other principles, believing as I do. If you will follow my remarks in the RECORD, you will find I am just about 100 percent right on that one thing, as I have stated in the RECORD. It is true that I have called attention to certain organizations that I call subversive.

Mr. PATRICK. Will you please answer the question I asked?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

Mr. THORKELSON. The gentleman should ask himself the question. He knows more about it than I do.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Does the gentleman from Montana yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. THORKELSON. I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Has a Member a right to speak until he has been recognized by the Chair and been yielded to by the gentleman who has the floor?

Mr. THORKELSON. I do not expect anything else from the gentleman from Alabama. [Laughter.]

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. THORKELSON. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, do I get an answer to my parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The answer is obvious. [Laughter.]

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Is it not a fact that the headquarters of the Silver Shirts and the Ku Klux Klan are down below the Mason and Dixon's line in the States of Alabama and North Carolina, and not in Montana?

Mr. THORKELSON. Yes; they are in the sunny South.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Gentlemen from the South ought to be in better position to give us information about them than the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. THORKELSON. Yes; I shall be pleased to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What is the rule about obtaining the floor? Does the Member who desires to ask a question have to address the Chair or the Member who is speaking?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The rules require that a Member desiring to ask a question shall address the Chair and the Member speaking.

The gentleman from Montana will proceed.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKELSON. Not at this point. If the gentleman can get my time extended I shall be pleased to yield.

Mr. HOOK. I shall be pleased to ask that the gentleman's time be extended. Does the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. THORKELSON. Yes; but will the gentleman please ask for extension of time?

Mr. HOOK. What I want to know is—

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understood that the gentleman from Montana yielded to the gentleman from Michigan. The regular order is for the gentleman from Michigan to ask his question.

Mr. HOOK. Is it not just as reasonable to expect the Dies committee or any other committee to go out into the

States during primary campaigns in which people must register their party affiliations and get lists of all the Communists in the United States and print them? We would then have a real list instead of a phony list about which the gentleman talks now. Would not that be more reasonable?

Mr. THORKELSON. I know nothing about a phony list. I accept the list of the Dies committee as authentic. I think we should have the lists of all memberships, with none left out.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended for 10 minutes, because we have taken up a considerable portion of his time asking questions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELSON. Getting back again to the subject I started to discuss, there seems to be some difference of opinion in respect to what we have a right to do. We have a perfect right to clear our ships for any port, but it is better that we clear them for a neutral port than for a port in a country at war. For a number of years it has been the usual custom when war is declared for countries not directly participating to declare their neutrality, to state that they will adhere to the principles the warring nations have set forth. It is asserted by commentators that had we passed the Neutrality Act, this ship, the *City of Flint*, would not have been captured; but I say in reply to that that it does not make any difference, because we have no business to clear a ship for the war zone. The embargo clause, whether repealed or not repealed, makes no difference when a ship carries contraband cargo to a nation at war.

The trouble with the Neutrality Act is not in the embargo clause, for that is something that is always under control. The trouble with the Neutrality Act lies in the fact that it lodges too much power in the hands of the President. In this connection I call attention to the RECORD of October 23. What powers do we give him? We give him the power to declare that a state of war exists. Having done that, he can intern all American shipping in our ports, he can tie them up to the docks. We give him power in case of violation of his orders to fine citizens \$50,000. It does not make any difference what he fines them for, he can find almost any excuse or pretext to fine a citizen. He is also given the power to shift the title, to transfer the title in goods to any foreign person or group of individuals, and then a cargo of merchandise to which title has been so transferred can be carried in foreign ships from our own ports, but our own ships are not permitted to carry that cargo.

Then Congress by legislation is to do something that no nation has ever done before, and that is to establish war zones and enforce operation in such zones outside of our own 3-mile limit. We have by legislation set aside an area from latitude 30 north and from the Greenwich Meridian, the first meridian, west to the one hundred and eighth meridian, as a neutral zone, and south of the thirtieth parallel to the South Pole as a neutral zone. Then the President is given power to allow the issuance of clearance to all ships in that neutral zone established by act of Congress. Unfortunately, other nations of the world are not going to accept that as a neutral zone, but they are going to sink our ships in that zone if we carry contraband cargo to nations at war. It is just such incidents, played upon by a subsidized press full of British propaganda, that will lead this Nation into war, because the people themselves do not understand that we have no right to be in such zones in the first place.

What further does the act do? It sets aside the China Ocean, the China Sea, as a neutral area. What right have we to do that? There are British colonies in the China Sea; there is British Indochina and many other colonies bordering the China Sea. Can we by act of Congress set aside that area and declare it neutral, then send our ships into that area and

not expect them to be attacked? Can we expect them to travel there in perfect safety? Of course not.

If we sail from our ports in the United States to the nations at war or to their territories or possessions, every trade route is a war zone, and no act of Congress can make it otherwise. We have no control outside of the 3-mile limit. The State Department came out with this information about 3 or 4 days ago. I proposed 20 questions with respect to the rights of neutrals, and I replied to those questions myself; and they are in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 11, page 304. If I am wrong, there is the best opportunity to call me.

Mr. Speaker, I have drafted a resolution, and I would like to call it to the attention of the Members of the House. This is a neutrality resolution. Of course, it will not be adopted. It will never be passed, but it will put the blame where it belongs. This proposed resolution of mine reads as follows:

Resolved, etc., That whenever the peace of the United States is threatened by foreign wars, the President shall, to promote the security, preserve peace, and to protect the lives of the citizens of the United States, issue a proclamation giving notice that a state of war exists between foreign states; and that

SEC. 2. Whenever the President has issued a proclamation under section 1, it shall be unlawful to clear ships under American registry and to issue passports to American citizens to nations at war; and that

SEC. 3. Whenever the President shall have issued proclamation under authority of section 1, it shall be unlawful—

- (a) To extend credit to nations at war.
- (b) To purchase foreign securities or redeem United States securities with gold in the United States Treasury.
- (c) To accept any kind of money except a gold dollar that contains 25.8 grains of gold nine-tenths fine, or the equivalent in foreign gold money, in payment for war materials sold to nations at war.

Then I have provided a penalty of \$50,000 for violation of the provisions of the resolution, and I would like to talk about that for a moment. The reason I provide that we should not sell our commodities for less than 25.8 grains of gold in the dollar is due to the fact that our people, our merchants and farmers, will earn 40 percent more on the merchandise they sell. Today you can take 1 ounce of gold and buy \$35 worth of merchandise. If this resolution is agreed to any foreign nation with an ounce of gold can buy only \$20.67 worth of merchandise, which means we will benefit to the extent of 40 percent if the resolution is agreed to. We cannot exchange bonds. We cannot shift them around and use them for war credits, because we cannot buy foreign bonds. We cannot buy any kind of bonds with money in the United States Treasury. In other words, we are actually declaring an embargo on the gold in the United States Treasury.

The bill provides further as follows:

(d) Whoever shall violate any of the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$50,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both. Should the violation be by a corporation, organization, or association, each officer or director thereof participating in the violation shall be liable to the penalty herein prescribed.

SEC. 4. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under authority of section 1, he may from time to time declare an embargo on any part or production of all commodities manufactured or produced in the United States.

(b) American merchant ships must be marked distinctly and all belligerents notified of such markings. When proceeding to neutral nations in active war zones, arrangements for safe passage must be made with the blockading powers.

SEC. 5. American vessels trading with nations at war or American citizens traveling on belligerent ships in war zones, do so at their own risk.

Now, I have provided a fine here, but I do not levy it against our business people, but on the people who can protect themselves. We Members of Congress have one purpose here. We are here to protect our own people. We are not here to protect the international racketeer financiers. This act will protect our people. It will put the fine on those people who extend this credit to foreign nations, the people who make it possible for our ships to be sent into the war zones and to foreign nations. I believe those are the people who ought to be penalized.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman says we are here to protect the American people. Is it his opinion that the Dies committee did that in publishing a list of the names of people who are innocent of the things with which they are charged?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. The people are innocent?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Absolutely. To my knowledge many of them are. They are not even members of this league.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I was not talking about the Dies committee.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Of course, it was done over my protest.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I do not know that. Why did the committee publish the list?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I think it was an un-American and reprehensible thing to accuse a lot of innocent people of belonging to a communistic organization.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I would not want to expose anyone who is innocent, but the gentleman knows we have many communistic organizations. He is on the committee. He has examined many of them. I believe that the people who are innocent and who are members of such organization should be informed about it, and then they should withdraw their membership. I think that is your duty and it is everybody's duty to warn the people of all subversive organizations, especially the communistic and anarchistic groups.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Many of them have withdrawn their membership. Does the gentleman realize that in issuing a list of the names of the people supposed to have been members of the League for Peace and Democracy that the Dies committee pointed out there was no evidence that a single one of them was a Communist?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Well, the gentleman here asked me if I was a Silver Shirt and a member of that organization. I am not a member of that organization, but he calls me one right here in this House. I am not listed with any organization, except the United States Naval Reserve. These people were evidently on the membership list, and so listed, and I think the committee should be commended for digging down to where the trouble may be found.

Mr. DEMPSEY. They are not members.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER]?

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] is entitled to recognition for 4 minutes.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended 6 minutes in addition, making a total of 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE]?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object. I want to hear the first part of the gentleman's speech.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the press this morning reports the intention of the Special Committee on un-American Activities to publish the names of Government employees who are members of the Washington branch of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Individual members of the American League in Washington have made no secret of their affiliation with this organization and might volunteer, as individuals, publicly to announce it at this time. But the purpose of the proposed publication, which, incidentally, since this was written, has taken place, coupled by the repetition of unfounded charges against the organization as a whole, and blanket condemnation of all members, can have but one purpose. That is to intimidate the members, threatening that the penalty of refusing to resign may be loss of their jobs.

The committee then, it would seem, is guilty of engaging in un-American activities, the very thing they were designed to expose and stamp out.

Even if this country were at war, such an attempt to intimidate American citizens would be unjustified. But this country is at peace with all nations, and determined to remain at peace. No emergency exists which could possibly excuse the abrogation of our traditional civil rights.

Government employees, similar to all other citizens of this republic, have the indubitable and inalienable right to join organizations of their own choosing. They have the right to judge for themselves the nature and the purpose of such organizations. They have the right to hold and to express their own opinions on all subjects, without submitting those opinions to any individual or Government body for approval. Government employees, no less than workers in private industry, must be permitted to exercise these constitutional American rights without coercion from any source or fear of losing their jobs as a consequence of such exercise.

No imputation has been made before the Dies committee or before any other public body, charging a single individual member of the American League for Peace and Democracy with an illegal act. If such a charge had been made, the machinery for prosecution and trial under the laws of the land exists and would be invoked against the individual so accused. Persecution of whole groups of people, based solely upon disapproval of the beliefs they hold and express, is wholly un-American and can only be destructive of the very foundations of democracy.

If the aim of the Dies committee is to preserve this Nation from the curse of dictatorship, that aim cannot be achieved by introducing the methods and standards of dictators here. [Applause.]

I call upon all members of the committee to clarify their position.

Two of the members of the committee, a few minutes before these remarks, have already clarified their position. They deserve hearty commendation for their stand from the patriotic Members of this House, and I denominate all Members of this House as patriotic.

I call upon the House of Representatives and the Roosevelt administration to repudiate this unwarranted interference with rights of citizens. I call upon the American people themselves to reaffirm their devotion to the American Constitution and the Bill of Rights and to demand of their Representatives that the fundamental principles of American democracy be respected and upheld.

I want to take this opportunity publicly to commend three members of that committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY], and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY], who have stated either formally or informally, in public or in private, their opposition to the unjust and unjustifiable publication of the names of several hundred members of the Washington, D. C., branch of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I call to your particular attention the fact that in the Washington Times-Herald noon edition of today there appears an article headed by a certain headline. I want to read this headline to the House of Representatives so that you may know what it is.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended 6 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. In the Washington Times-Herald today appear the names of not only those who are avowedly members of this organization, but those who are on the mailing list of the organization.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I say to the gentleman that that is so denominated in the paper, but it does not happen to be the case. I can assure the gentleman that this list does not include the mailing list. That is a membership list.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I thank the gentleman for his correction, and accept it.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. DEMPSEY. It does contain the names of the people who made contributions, for instance, for the refugees in Spain, and who were not members of the League for Peace and Democracy.

Mr. COX and Mr. THORKELOSON rose.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I will yield when I complete this statement.

In a headline of today's edition of the Times-Herald appear these words—

Dies to name 800 United States aides as "reds" today.

This statement is libelous per se, and if the gentleman waived his congressional immunity he could or might be liable for plenty of libel suits in the courts of the land if he authorized it in such words. The statement that is made in the headline of today's Washington Times-Herald indicates very clearly that war hysteria is pervading the House of Representatives and some newspapers that the majority of constituted representatives of this special committee, acting as ostensible agents of this body, supposed to be the most potent legislative assembly in the world, have so subverted the purpose for which the committee was designed that they themselves are subject to grave censure for having engaged in un-American activities.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I decline to yield.

Furthermore, I attended a meeting of the committee on Monday afternoon, at which time a colloquy took place between certain members of the committee and a distinguished divine, one of the leading and most learned scholars in America, Dr. Harry Ward, a member of the faculty of Union Theological Seminary, the man who is president of this organization now under attack. During the course of this colloquy interrogatories were put to the gentleman to whose name I have just referred. They asked his opinion about the treaty between Soviet Russia and Germany. They asked his opinion on the Loyalist Spain controversy, whether or not he was for Loyalist Spain or against it. They then drew the conclusion, because he expressed sympathy for Loyalist Spain, that he must know that the Communists took the same line, and naturally the inference was very plain.

I want to reaffirm what a certain gentleman said 150 years ago in France, a man by the name of Voltaire, who in a letter to Helvetius, said in substance: "I may not agree with a single word you say, but I will fight to the death to uphold your right to say it."

It was upon that principle that Thomas Jefferson wrote in the Declaration of Independence, as the result of which the Constitution was adopted, the immortal words, carved in letters of flaming gold on the pillars of the modern era, insuring to posterity the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of religious worship. Do we have freedom of speech?

Mr. THORKELOSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I would like to yield to the gentleman from Montana. He is a persistent commentator on this subject. I want to discuss this question of freedom of speech. A while ago I objected to there being placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the gentleman from Montana the names of those who purportedly were members of this organization, the Washington, D. C., branch of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

I happen to be somewhat familiar with this organization, and make no apology for that familiarity. I make no apology for having addressed several meetings of the American League for Peace and Democracy along with some of the most distinguished people in the American Government today, including the highest officials in this administration and

including many prominent members of other parties; and by that I mean the Republican Party, the Farmer-Labor Party, and the Progressive Party. In the meetings I have addressed I have found no evidence of communistic control of this organization whatsoever. Personally I am not any more for the Communist Party than I am for the Nazi Party. I am not a member of the Communist Party, but I have seen speeches made on this floor and heard remarks uttered here to the effect that if a person showed sympathy for the program of any liberal organization, with whose philosophy the person talking may be in disagreement, he must be a member himself, ipso facto, of the Communist Party.

I do not accuse the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKEKELSON] of being a member of the Silver Shirts, although its official organ, *Liberation*, has proposed the gentleman as a candidate for President of the United States. I do not accuse the gentleman from Montana of being a member of the German-American Bund, even though their official publications have spoken of him as perhaps the outstanding statesman in the Congress of the United States.

I recognize that the gentleman from Montana is entitled to his beliefs. Many of us may disagree with those beliefs, but we do not accuse him, therefore and inevitably, of belonging to organizations which give expression to the same ideas.

So I think we ought to use a little common sense in refusing to permit our committees to subvert the Constitution and be guilty of the conduct against which they are so prone to inveigh in the case of those in liberal or leftist organizations.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 10 more minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, I wonder, when I come along here for about 5 minutes, if you are going to get me 5 minutes more.

Mr. GEYER of California. I will be pleased to ask that you have your time extended 5 more minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Does the gentleman contend that the Commonwealth Federation of New York, and the Commonwealth Congress are not communistic organizations?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I do believe that that organization is not a communistic organization.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. And the principles that they propose in their bylaws are not communistic?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I affirm that they are not communistic. I do not agree with every principle, but I affirm they are not communistic.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. When they come out in their bylaws and declare themselves that they are going to destroy the United States, you say that is not communistic?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. They definitely and decidedly do not say that in their bylaws.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I understand you are one of the sponsors of it.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. There are a great many sponsors and a great many organizations. I have never attended a meeting and have merely read their literature.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield.

Mr. COX. If there is not something that is bad about this so-called League for Peace and Democracy, if it is not actually a front for the Communist Party, if there were not something about it that members should wish to conceal, then why object to the publication of a list of the members of the Washington chapter?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I will tell you why, if I get an opportunity. The president of the local branch at Washington, D. C., of the American League for Peace and Democracy told the Dies committee chairman that voluntarily he would surrender that list if the committee would request it. The national president of that or-

ganization also told the chairman of the committee the league would be glad to surrender any documents requested, but on the other hand, the committee sent down certain agents of the committee, aided and assisted by United States deputy marshals, and they raided the office. They put padlocks upon the property, sealed the files, and virtually expelled Miss Lucy Hancock, who was temporarily in charge of the local branch offices. They kept guards in and out of the offices all night. In other words, they were guilty of the very practices which we are eager to condemn in the case of Germany and Russia. They secured these documents by illegal means, when they could have gone down there and merely asked them to produce them.

Instead of that, with a subpoena duces tecum, without definite date fixed for responding, they went down there, without any time specified, and seized those documents which you know as a lawyer they had no right to seize. I want the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], who is a good lawyer, to know that I am not here in the capacity of an apologist for the American League. They may be guilty of certain practices with which I disagree. That is not the point. The point to which I am talking is that we do not want ourselves, when we are investigating un-American activities, to be guilty of those things which we charge as communism or subversiveness in others.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield.

Mr. COX. Of course, I agree that we should be very careful to do nothing that would reflect upon innocent people.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. That is right.

Mr. COX. It is very easy for me to understand that our most patriotic and loyal citizen might, under certain circumstances, become a member of an organization which was bad, and be perfectly innocent in joining it. I agree that we should proceed carefully; and it is reasonable to suppose, even if the organization is bad, as charged, that there are those who happen to be members who do not, as the gentleman has said, share in the philosophy that might be embraced in and practiced by the league.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. If you will allow me to proceed uninterruptedly for a moment—yes; I yield to the gentleman from Alabama, a member of the committee to which I referred.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I have great personal affection and esteem for the gentleman from Washington, but when he makes the bold and bald statement here that the committee seized those records unlawfully and engaged in practices which smacked of Hitlerism, and so forth, he makes a statement which has absolutely no foundation in truth, and the record speaks for itself in that connection, and at the proper time will be presented to this House so that it can pass judgment on it. I have a great regard for the gentleman, but I hope he sticks to the facts in the case. I affirm, as a member of that committee, after hearing the sworn testimony, pro and con, in this matter only on day before yesterday, and with the documentary proof before that committee, that there is absolutely no foundation in fact for the statement that the gentleman has made here on the floor today, that the committee seized those records unlawfully. They were taken under subpoena duces tecum, and only brought to our committee after full knowledge and consent of the league itself, and with written letters of consent on file in our records. [Applause.]

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I am naturally reluctant to take direct issue with my good friend, for whom I can echo the same sentiments. I have the warmest affection for the gentleman, and I say that with all sincerity and not as political blah. The gentleman and I do not always agree on matters of public policy, but I know of his great ability and I am cognizant of the fine service he has rendered.

But I say in all sincerity that I made that statement not out of whole cloth, but after talking to 18 different people, all of whom were not directly at the place at the time but

directly involved in this proceeding. I would suggest to the Dies committee that they subpoena a list of witnesses which I can supply, every one of whom will affirm and back up what I have said on this floor. And they are not fly-by-nights. They are not illiterate nobodies. Among them are some of the most prominent, most intellectual, and brilliant people in the American Government. They are not engaged in lies and falsification.

So there has been some misunderstanding, one way or the other, and I would be happy if the committee would subpoena the list which I will furnish to the gentleman, and the committee members can satisfy themselves then in most complete and comprehensive form.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Is it not a fact that Dr. Matthews, the star investigator of the Dies committee, was one of the parents of this American League for Peace and Democracy baby, which he is now criticizing and condemning?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. He is one of the original founders of the American League Against War and Fascism, which was the parent organization of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Incidentally, I would offer as a constructive suggestion to the committee that the country might accept with more credibility the findings of the committee if at least a major share of the testimony came from those who have not been convicted of felonies. I would suggest that the country would take more kindly to the findings of the committee and the reports which they will make if the testimony concerning subversive activities would come from reputable citizens or those officials directly involved, and that if a man is charged as being a Communist in front of the committee, that he himself be subpoenaed and requested to touch on that very subject himself, rather than have the chairman make the statement, or any member of the committee, that "Now that we have established that So-and-so is a Communist, let us proceed from here." [Applause.] And how have they established it? They asked some convicted felon or some disgruntled former member of an organization what was his opinion about somebody. They did that about Governor Olson, of California, and they did that about Lieut. Gov. Ellis Patterson, of California. They asked a certain gentleman what his opinion was on those matters and he said, "I think he is a Communist." Then the committee went on and made a finding to the effect that they were, in effect, Communists.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I will yield if the gentleman will get me more time.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I will ask that the gentleman's time be extended.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. May I say to the gentleman from Washington that during the course of the investigation this year we have subpoenaed the heads of each of these organizations. If they do not know what their organization is and stands for, we do not know how to get the information. The committee is not responsible for the fact that the head of some of these organizations are convicted felons; we are not responsible for that.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Let me answer the gentleman.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I just wanted to get the RECORD straight on that point.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Let me point out to the gentleman from Alabama that his committee accepted testimony to the effect that John L. Lewis was, for practical purposes, a Communist, statements stemming from repeated asseverations that the C. I. O. was a Communist-controlled organization. Has this committee subpoenaed John L. Lewis or the heads of his organization and affiliated unions to ascertain the truth of these assertions?

The committee heard testimony of witnesses to the effect that Heywood Broun was a Communist. Broun demanded a chance to appear before the committee, and finally after wait-

ing for a month he was given an opportunity, and after waiting around all morning he came before the committee for a very short while.

The committee heard opinion evidence from witnesses to the effect that Rockwell Kent, one of America's outstanding artists, was a Communist. Was Rockwell Kent given an opportunity to appear before the committee and deny these allegations? He had to send a wire of denial to the committee. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I may say for the information of the gentleman from Washington that Heywood Broun appeared before the committee and the committee heard him out of order within a very few days after the committee began its work. As soon as his name was mentioned, he appeared and we gave him the opportunity.

Let me say to the gentleman most emphatically that not one single witness who appeared before that committee ever testified that John Lewis is a Communist; not one from the beginning to this very moment has made that statement.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. However, they testified that the C. I. O. was a Communist-controlled organization, that 12 or more or less of its international affiliated unions were Communist-controlled. The gentleman's committee did not ask these union heads to appear before the committee and explain the facts.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Let me answer the gentleman. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Let me give the gentleman the facts. The committee addressed a letter to John L. Lewis giving him the privilege of appearing to deny any statement made by any witness with reference to the existence of communism in any part of his organization or movement, but he has not dignified the invitation with a reply.

Let me say further to the gentleman that any man whose name is mentioned in connection with this investigation who is charged with being in collusion with the Communists or any other un-American movement in this country will be extended every opportunity to appear there and deny under oath that testimony. [Applause.]

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. That is what I wanted. I wanted to be sure that such right would not be denied.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. What the committee wants is for people to give the facts and not indulge in that sort of wild, loose statement we see made in the press and sometimes hear on the floor of the House.

Mr. THORKELOSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I do not have the floor.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I will have to decline to yield because the gentleman to whom the gentleman from Montana desires to direct his question does not wish to answer.

If I may proceed now; I will be through in a minute, because I know the time is very short. In many cities I have made a number of addresses on the subject of civil liberties. The plain people are gravely apprehensive lest they be deprived under one pretext or another of their precious civil liberties. At the conclusion of the last World War, we had an Attorney General of the United States by the name of A. Mitchell Palmer. Many of you who are friends of organized labor will remember that injunctions were sued out against labor unions at that time and there was continual labor baiting on the part of certain public officials working under the impact and stimulus of war hysteria, or due to an excess of patriotic zeal. What I am

concerned about is that we in the House of Representatives should be vigilant lest any of our citizens' rights be trod upon, whether we agree with the gentlemen who are affected or not, whether they be radio codes or attempts to censor the stage or the screen or whether they take the form of persecution or prosecution of organizations with the ideas of which we may be in disagreement. [Applause.] I have taken the floor today because of my indignation at the manner in which the names of reputable American citizens who are employed by the United States Government have been published in the public press under headlines by which they are denominated as reds and under a statement which says that some of them are on the mailing list of such organizations and some of them are members. What is the purpose of the chairman in giving out that list to the newspapers?

It appears to be obviously for the purpose of intimidating Government employees. It states in effect that we, a congressional committee, want you people to know you are jeopardizing your jobs. We know who you are, and we will get you when the time comes and when the hour seems propitious and appropriate. That is the effect of the published membership list on the Government employees affected. [Applause.]

I know a great many of these Government employees. I know that among the group are some of the ablest and most astute officials of the American Government. I know many members of the Washington Branch of the American League for Peace and Democracy. Some of them attend very infrequently. Some of them are interested because they supported the cause of the Spanish loyalists. Some of them are in it because they are in favor of repeal of the embargo. They support the President in his attitude on the neutrality law.

It is stated that this organization is a communistic organization. Well, the Communist Party is opposing the President in his advocacy of repeal of the embargo clause. This organization supports the President. There is, very possibly, a handful of Communists in the organization, as there is in nearly every other liberal organization.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I was very much interested in the discussion between the gentleman and members of the Dies committee, in which the gentleman contended that the names secured were secured in a rather roughshod manner. A member of the committee said they were secured legally. The gentleman said he could supply the committee with 18 names, among the most prominent members of the Government, who would bear out his position.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I said I could supply 18 names, among whom were prominent members of the Government.

Mr. MUNDT. The committee might not ask the gentleman for those names, since they are prominent men in the Government. Will the gentleman put those names in the Record, so that we may have contact with those gentlemen and find out the evidence they have to offer?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I do not intend to add any names to the list already here. I will supply the committee. I know some members of that committee still want to take that up, and I will be eager to supply those names.

Mr. Speaker, it was naturally with reluctance that I embarked upon the task of criticizing a committee of this House. One cannot be a Member of this body long without learning to cherish for his colleagues of both sides a warmth and affection which in many cases is beautiful and touching. In what I have said relative to the conduct of the Dies committee I have entertained no rancor toward its genial chairman nor toward the other members of that committee. I admit freely that the committeemen have expended long hours and unremitting energy in an endeavor to learn the truth concerning un-American activities. My expressions here today have been motivated solely by convictions arising spontaneously from a profound and deep-seated disagreement with the tactics employed by the committee.

Let the unvarnished truth come forth unblushingly relative to all subversive activities, but let the persons accused have their day in court, and see to it that those adversely affected by the plenitudinous publicity, with which the committee's functioning and the chairman's numerous utterances are illuminated, may be accorded every modicum of protection and rights, as guaranteed under the laws and the Constitution, and adhered to in every court of record in our land. In all helpfulness, I earnestly suggest to the committee that it lean backward in not mistaking a subpoena duces tecum for a search warrant; that it keep in mind the first amendment to the Constitution; that it meticulously uphold all regulations and statutes respecting search and seizure; that it refuse to accept evidence from convicted felons without properly discounting the same in view of the source; that it decline to admit into evidence opinion testimony wholly unsupported or unsubstantiated, and without the witness having qualified himself as required in any court of record; that it deny to publicity seekers the opportunity to use its forum as a sounding board for the venting of spites and the securing of vengeance against a person or group who discharged the witness for disloyalty or incompetence.

It seems to me to be of the utmost importance that a committee established by Congress for the purpose of revealing un-American activities should be exceedingly scrupulous to observe the legal amenities and to be watchful that it so conduct itself as not to be subjected justly to the disfavor, if not denunciation, of those who insist upon fairness and justice to even the humblest and most defenseless in our land. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the reading of the Journal, the disposition of all business on the Speaker's table, and at the conclusion of any previous special orders, I may address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIROVICH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the address of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CREAL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the Record.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] made a very valuable contribution to the proceedings of the House. He has, I think, clarified some of the issues before us. The gentleman quoted Voltaire's statement about the right of free speech, and said in substance that he too, while he might disagree with what one had to say, would fight to the death to maintain his right to state or speak his views. But I wonder if the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] had that in mind when he objected this afternoon to the insertion of an article by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELOSON] in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD? I wonder if it occurred to him at that time that the gentleman from Montana was being denied the right of free speech, the right to a free press, the right to spread on the record his views?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not now. I noticed, too, that the gentleman spoke about the right of every American to join any organization he wanted, and I agree with him, but I wonder if he had in mind, when he was talking about the

right of an American citizen to join an organization or not join an organization, the demand of the C. I. O., that before one may work he has to join that organization? Time and again the gentleman has upheld the activities of the C. I. O., which denies the right of an employee to join a company union, an individual union, the A. F. of L., or to remain free from all union ties if that employee would work in a factory which is under the domination of the C. I. O. Did he think about that? I wonder if he did.

Why not be consistent about some of these things? Then the gentleman became greatly exercised over the fact that some one might be accused unjustly of communism if his name was given to the public as being a member of this American League for Peace and Democracy. But the gentleman followed that up by himself making two accusations on the floor of the House against members of the Dies committee. When he makes those statements he is challenged as to their truthfulness by a member of that committee on the floor of the House.

Why shed any tears about someone being accused in a newspaper unjustly and then come on the floor of the House and accuse unjustly and falsely, as is claimed by another Member, five or six members of a committee and make charges and then have the rest of us, who are listening to the gentleman from Washington, told by the gentleman from Alabama that his charges so made are absolutely false and that there is no foundation to them?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. The gentleman can believe whomsoever he wants to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Certainly we can. We are looking to the gentleman to bring before the House proof of the charges he made against members of the Dies committee and make good or retract his statement. We are looking to him to bring to the House proof that someone testified before the Dies committee, as he charged, that John L. Lewis was a Communist. A member of that committee just stated on the floor that no one so testified. Behind the gentleman now sits a member of that committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], who has never been accused of being a Tory or a reactionary. He said on the floor, if I heard him correctly, and he may correct me if I am in error, there was proof which convinced him that this organization to which the gentleman referred was controlled by Communists.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I said, I believe, that I was personally compelled to the conclusion, on the basis of evidence that had been presented to me and the committee, that this organization was substantially dominated by the Communist Party.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is the statement I understood the gentleman to make.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE], who so often intimates that some of us, myself in particular, are anti-labor, is, in my humble opinion, utterly mistaken in his conclusions that the Dies committee has done a grievous wrong. As the record stands, those in whose behalf he speaks belong to an organization which, however worthy its avowed purpose, is controlled by another organization which teaches the overthrow of our Government by force. Giving the members of the first organization the benefit of the doubt to which they are entitled, the fact now remains that that organization has been branded in public as being controlled by the Communists. Why, then, should not every patriotic American who is a member of that organization and who does not approve of the teachings of the Communist Party get out of it and get out of it publicly. No doubt but that the names of some of these individuals who are members of the American League for Peace and Democracy have been used, prior to this time, to secure other members to give weight to the arguments given out by the league. If the league, as it is claimed, is now shown to be controlled by the Communists, those same members should welcome the opportunity to publicly sever their connections with it. Why be used as a stooge by the Communist Party?

But the thought which I want to bring to the House at this time is this: The gentleman from Washington today, as he does so often, calls attention to the necessity of pre-

serving civil liberty in this country. He spoke of the necessity of free speech, of a free press, if our liberties are to be maintained. But today he denied to a fellow Member the right of free speech. He spoke of the right of a man to join an organization, but often he has spoken in favor of an organization which denies the right of the worker to join any organization other than its own. He spoke of the injustice of making false accusations.

If we believe the statements of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], and the statement of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES], who are members of the Dies committee, then the gentleman from Washington makes an accusation against that committee which was without foundation of fact. Why so bitterly condemn these three things and then, almost before the echo of his condemnation has died away, commit the same fault?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. The proof before the committee is absolutely conclusive, both at our hearings last year and again this year, that the organization was founded by Communists—and that was found and reported to the House—and that it is dominated and controlled by the Communist Party as a Communist-front organization.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Here the Members of the House have before them the fair, plain issue as to whether the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] are correct or whether the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] is accurate in his statement. It seems to me it is about time, with these charges floating back and forth and the House appropriating \$100,000, or whatever the sum was, for the Dies committee to carry on its activities—and I heartily support the committee as a whole and am in sympathy with its activities—for us to learn whether the committee is carrying out its activities in an American way and under the Constitution, or whether it is true, as the gentleman from Washington has said, that it seized illegally, and in violation of civil rights, the records of this organization. If it appears in the end that the committee is correct and is not subject to criticism, then it is due the House and it is due the gentleman from Washington himself that he rise on the floor of the House and say that he is mistaken.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; for a question.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. The president of the local branch was before the Dies committee yesterday afternoon and stated categorically that these documents were seized. The secretary was there and ready to testify. All the officers were present and ready to testify to the same thing. The gentleman can draw his own conclusions as to which is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And you can draw your own conclusions when you know it is a fundamental principle of the Communist Party for its members to deny all connection with that party when they are called upon.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. If the gentleman wishes to infer that these reputable persons are Communists, let him make the statement away from this Hall and hold himself liable to a civil court.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not say, and I did not intend to say, here or elsewhere that any member of that organization is a Communist, for I have not read the testimony, and I am not aware that I am acquainted with a single member of the organization, and most assuredly, I would not make a charge of any kind unless I had a substantial foundation for that charge.

The gentleman from Washington is very free with his accusations and with his condemnation of those who do not agree with his conclusions, and he should be fairly accurate in his statements which purport to be statements of fact.

I am not charging that they are Communists. In fact, as I understand the statements which have been made on the floor,

the committee itself gives out the information not that individuals who are named are Communists but, rather, that they are not Communists, but that they belong to an organization which was founded by and whose activities are controlled by Communists.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I want to say positively that they are not Communists.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not charging that they are. I am saying here and now that a member of the committee stated a moment ago that there was proof that the organization was substantially controlled by Communists. What I cannot understand is this: Why should any man be ashamed of joining an organization or belonging to an organization and remain a member of that organization? If I belong to the Methodist Church, I am not running around apologizing for it. If I am a veteran of the Civil War or a World War veteran, I am not apologizing for it. If I belong to the Masonic order, I am not apologizing for it. If I belong to the order of skunks—

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Maybe you do.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will not apologize for it so long as I continue a member in good standing.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I was just joking.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Maybe I do, but if I do I do not go around apologizing for it. When I find I belong to an organization I am ashamed of, I will welcome the opportunity to resign and withdraw.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I want to comment on what the gentleman said, that I was ashamed to belong to these organizations. I was not ashamed to belong to the organizations. I was ashamed of being branded, and they object to being branded, as "reds" in the newspapers by any handout of the Dies committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is all right, but here is the point: If the organization, as the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] says, is controlled by the Communists, is it not time that these people who object to being classed as Communists, which they are not—and I accept your statement on that—is it not time they withdrew?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me briefly?

Mr. HOFFMAN. If I were branded as belonging to an order of ex-convicts, and it was not true, and it was printed in the papers, immediately I would deny it and get my name printed there as not being a member, and we will be glad, I am sure, to give the unanimous consent of this House to publish a list of the members of this league with a statement that they do not belong to the Communist Party and are not Communists, as you say they are not, and I accept your word. I have no doubt but that many people who are not Communists have been caught in bad company in an organization which is controlled by Communists.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. How would you like to have your name printed as a Communist in the headlines of every paper of the United States and then have them say later on that they would give you an opportunity to deny it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have been called things as bad as a Communist and it never worried me. I just thought the man was uninformed or that his judgment was poor. It is what a man is, not what is said about him that matters. Once a man was crucified because of what was said about him but it is through His name that we ask divine help.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I just want the gentleman to realize that the statement which I make is on the basis of what I have had presented to me and that I have been in a position, as a member of this committee, to have a lot of these things presented to me that hardly anybody else would have presented to him, and I believe that is an important thing to bear in mind.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am accepting the gentleman's statement, because, as I have stated, everyone here on the floor, I am sure, who has heard the very earnest and conscientious gentleman from California speak, realizes he is honest and

that he is earnest. We all know that and we also know that your sympathies go toward the left instead of the right or a reactionary administration.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. So when you say this organization is controlled by the Communists, we accept it, while, perhaps, if somebody on the extreme right made such a statement, we would not be so quick to accept it. When you, Mr. VOORHIS, say that the evidence presented to you convinces you that this organization is controlled by the Communists, I am quite sure not only that those who control it are pink, but that they are red, a deep, dark red.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 or 10 more minutes—which does the gentleman want?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Five minutes will be enough, if the gentleman does not take all of it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEYER of California. I just want to ask the gentleman's permission to make this observation—

Mr. HOFFMAN. Make a speech, you mean; go ahead. [Laughter.]

Mr. GEYER of California. Just a short one. Everyone knows what I think of my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], but inasmuch as there are 25 members on the executive board of this League for Peace and Democracy and 2 of those members are members of the Communist Party, 3 of them are reverends in the different churches, I hope he will put in the RECORD how he has arrived at the conclusion that this organization is controlled by the Communist Party rather than by the Christian organizations of this Nation. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield me 1 minute now? [Laughter.]

Mr. GEYER of California. Yes; you may have a minute now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Here is the thought I would like to leave with you. The Communist Party preaches the overthrow of this Government by force. Now, why should anyone who subscribes to that doctrine and who is willing to carry it out, be retained in the service of the United States Government, the Government which that organization seeks to overthrow? [Applause.]

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. No; I want the gentleman to yield for a question.

It is not astonishing to find so many members of the New Deal administration in this list. I may say that in Milwaukee, the American League for Peace and Democracy, a creature of the Communist Party, has been working on a broad and active front with the Communist Party. I do not see why the Members of Congress should be so hesitant about printing that list in the RECORD. May I ask the gentleman if he does not concur in the belief that the Dies committee should immediately call each and every one of those Government employees and swear them and then ask each and every one of them if they now belong or have ever belonged to this communistic American League for Peace and Democracy. I have in my office—and if the gentleman wants to get the information he can do so—the campaign literature put out in the 1938 campaign in Milwaukee by the Communist Party, which states that the people of Wisconsin should elect new dealers to Congress who will give active support to President Roosevelt's New Deal.

Mr. GORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Much has been said about the right of the American citizen to join any organization. I have listened with interest and have not heard that right controverted. Is it not also the right of the American people to know the

membership of any organization, and especially one which is conceived in, and nurtured by subversive philosophy?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Unless the organization is disreputable I suppose anyone would be proud to have his name published as a member. I understand the Daughters of the American Revolution like to have their names printed in this, that, or the other. Members of Congress always like to be introduced as "Congressman Jones." They love to see their names in print as Members of Congress. If not proud of an organization why not get out? [Applause and laughter.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on some of these things at this particular time, but there has been so much discussed today that it seemed to me almost necessary to do so.

Last January I opposed the continuance of the Dies committee. Subsequent to that time the Speaker asked me to become a member of this committee. I appreciated the confidence he showed in me more than I can say, and since that time I have been a member of this committee.

What I want to give today is as nearly accurate a picture as I can give you in a few minutes, both of the work of that committee and what the real truth is about some of these things we hear so much about.

I am going to preface it by saying that I think there are certain real dangers to American democracy today. I cannot discuss them all. I think one of the real dangers is the real, honest-to-goodness subversive activities. I think there are some of them on the extreme right, and I think there are some of them on the extreme left. I think another danger is the danger of the cheap political efforts on the part of people of both moderate right and moderate left to brand their political opponents with labels which they are not entitled to, and to try to lump them in with groups which really are not fundamentally devoted to the principles of American constitutional democracy. Of those dangers I am frank to say that I think the second one is more serious than the first, but I am also frank to say that I believe that an investigation, properly and carefully conducted, to bring out the facts regarding those movements which are fundamentally devoted to foreign systems of government and basically controlled by foreign agents and governments is a good thing.

After all, democracy cannot use the kind of methods that dictatorships use in defending themselves against movements which seek to undermine its foundations and destroy the liberty upon which those organizations are able to grow. If a democracy cannot do that, then the only method democracy has to rely upon is the method of decent and full publicity.

I am perfectly willing to say right now that as far as I am personally concerned, I do not believe the way to handle the problem of real subversive activities is to suppress organizations. The reason I say that is because I think such action is contrary to the principle of democracy; that we cannot do it in the case of one organization without threatening others, because I do not think it would be wise or smart or effective, because as soon as you do that you drive something underground and make it much more dangerous than would otherwise be the case.

I think the only remedies we have are two: First, to require full publicity and full facts about every organization that professes to teach the American people any kind of political doctrine whatsoever. Second, a constructive reform of the economic situation of this country so that you will not have the soil in which those things are allowed to grow.

I think many people who welcome the work of this committee are omitting the necessary emphasis on these economic requirements which are absolutely necessary in order to constructively solve this problem.

Now, I want to say one or two things. In the first place, I think that substantially the work of this committee has been important. There have been some people called as

witnesses who have been in jail. That is true. Heads of organizations have been called also, however, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] has pointed out. I have tried, and other members of the committee have tried, to have a balanced record, and I think that anybody who takes the trouble to read the record he will find that the record is balanced. That, for example, when witnesses come along and state that an organization is a communistic organization, they have been asked the question whether they meant the members of that organization were Communists or not.

The answer was "No; we do not mean that. We mean to say that a handful of people, by careful organization and careful work, have succeeded in gaining and keeping control over its policies and actions, which enabled them to work their will with the larger organization." And may I say that this has been possible primarily because people like me, for instance, have not worked hard enough and effectively enough at solving the problems of the people of our country, and have not done as well as we might have for the oppressed people of this country, and have let other groups of people with ulterior motives come in and do that job.

Other questions have been asked. References have been made today to the matter of John L. Lewis. Let me say that never once has any witness before the committee accused John L. Lewis of being a Communist. Over and over again those witnesses have been enjoined by members of the committee on that very point, and I am positive the record is clear. There has been testimony regarding other people and regarding labor organizations; and I can say that in every one of those cases likewise the question has been asked: "Do you mean to charge that the membership of this labor organization is composed of Communists?" And every single time the answer is no, that what really has happened has been that a small group of people once again has gained an undue amount of influence.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Then the gentleman feels that the committee by its action in allowing the list of names to be published has made possible the committing of a grave injustice, does he not?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will come to that point right now. I may say to the gentleman from Washington that I think the publishing of the list of names is wrong. Let me give the reasons why I believe so. I believe so, first, because I know perfectly well, and the committee in its statement so states, that it has no evidence that these people are Communists. The list is not published by the committee with that in view, or with the view of making any such charge. I agree with the gentleman from Washington that the way this publicity is put out with the kind of headlines that accompany it does a grave injustice to these people.

I feel, furthermore, that it has made the same mistake that has been made over and over in the past by people who thought they were combatting subversive activities in this country, the mistake of including large numbers of people who, everybody will know, are not Communists, Nazis, or anything else un-American. The result is that when real facts about these things are presented they are not nearly as effective as they otherwise would be. I believe, furthermore, that the real job this committee has to do is not that of questioning individuals or obtaining and publishing lists of individuals, but determining as near as it can the facts about organizations.

What are un-American activities? What are the things this committee should pay attention to—and which, substantially, I want to say in fairness I believe the committee has paid attention to? I think they are these: I think they are the activities of organizations which are substantially controlled and directed from outside the United States and are under the influence of foreign governments or foreign agencies.

This is what I conceive the work of this committee to be. I do not believe it is the work of this committee to question

the economic views of any person. All Americans have a right to their own economic views. I also believe that the work of the committee can be regarded as including the activities of organizations which seek by means of forceful methods to deny to any group of people their constitutional American rights either by stirring up racial hatred or any similar method.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. LEAVY. I feel that I have kept a fairly open mind on the matter of the merits or demerits of the Dies committee. I have heard it praised and I have heard it condemned, both in measure beyond its possible just deserts. To me the severest criticism of the committee is that it seized books, records, and papers in violation of the Constitution, in violation of the laws of the land, and went beyond its jurisdiction. I do not know whether this charge be true or false, but I do feel that in fairness to the Congress which created this committee the record ought to be cleared. If the facts be as the officers of this league in question contend, then certainly the seizure was illegal. No court in America would permit evidence obtained in that manner to be used. If on the other hand there was a voluntary surrender by someone in authority of the books, documents, and papers to an agent or representative of the committee we would have an entirely different situation. I think this ought to be cleared up and I believe the committee owes it to the Congress to clear it up, certainly before it asks for further funds.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am in agreement with the gentleman that it should be cleared up. I, unfortunately, am not a lawyer. From what I have been able to gather about the facts of this matter, my own private judgment is that the thing boils down largely to a feeling on the one hand that a subpoena should not have been used, that a simple request should have been made for these records, and on the other hand to the fact that a subpoena was used. I am not convinced in my own mind that the records were seized without consent. My understanding is that consent was given. Personally I would be very glad to have any further facts on this matter brought out. I am not in favor, and I do not believe the other members of the committee are in favor, of having the committee proceed in any manner contrary to a strict adherence to the Constitution.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama and Mr. PITTENGER rose.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield first to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. In order to clear up any misapprehension that may exist about this so-called illegal seizure of records, I made the flat statement on the floor a moment ago that it was without foundation. The facts adduced by sworn testimony before the committee in regard to this dispute from both sides were about as follows: A subpoena duces tecum was issued. An agent of the committee went to the headquarters of the local branch to serve the subpoena and found no one present who was willing to accept service. The lady who was supposed to work in the office absented herself and stayed away for hours. Under the circumstances the investigator called the attorney for the committee who had previously worked with the F. B. I. for 10 years and who is a trained lawyer. He came down to headquarters. He called the head of the Washington branch, a lawyer. That gentleman came over to the local headquarters and then they called Dr. Ward, head of the national organization in New York City, and Dr. Ward so testified.

Not a single record was removed from that office, not a one, on that occasion, but with the consent of everybody present on both sides were locked up in a closet in the office by the investigator. The office was then locked up and the

key retained by the American League for Peace and Democracy. On the following day, with the full consent of the local branch, and over the signature of the head of the local branch, these records were brought up to the committee. Those are the sworn facts. As to little items of dispute or as to matters of personal feeling, those are inconsequential. No records are being seized illegally; no records have been obtained except by subpoena duces tecum, and after the subpoena was issued the records were not brought into the possession of the committee until written consent of the head of the organization was given. Call that illegal if you wish. Those are the facts, based on sworn testimony in the record and not hearsay.

Mr. LEAVY. May I say that I did not state that any procedure was illegal. I stated that the facts ought to be given the House.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Those are the facts, I can assure the gentleman, and the record will bear them out.

Mr. LEAVY. I would like to know to whom the subpoena duces tecum was directed. Certainly it was directed to somebody.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. As I understand, it was directed to the head of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Mr. LEAVY. It named an individual?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. As I understand, it did.

Mr. LEAVY. Then, of course, there could be no rights accrue under it until it was served on the individual to whom it was directed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. I want to make an observation and then ask the gentleman a question. I have attended several meetings of the committee as a bystander and as a Member of Congress. I have yet to find in any of those meetings an indication on the part of any member of that committee to be unfair to anybody, or an indication on the part of any member of that committee to deprive anybody of the right to come and testify and give information to it. The gentleman being a member of the committee, may I ask if he has found that any member of the committee tried to deprive anybody of any rights before that committee?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman and I may say to the gentleman that on the whole the committee has conducted its hearings in a proper, fair way. There have been things happen from time to time that I might not altogether have agreed with, but I believe the mistakes that have been made, where they have been made, have been made not in the hearings but in matters like the publication of this list and matters of that character.

Mr. GORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. May I make the observation in all fairness that in my opinion the gentleman from California has demonstrated himself to be exemplary and patriotic.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, the difficulty with the work of a committee of this kind is that certain facts may be seized upon and used in ways that are not justified by the facts themselves. Findings of this committee might for example be used as an excuse for persecution of labor. In my opinion, if I may give the picture very briefly, the real truth about the matter is that we have comparatively small groups of people in this country, the Nazis and Fascists on the one hand and Communists on the other, substantially devoted to foreign sys-

tems of government, that attempt to work in the interest of those foreign systems of government in the United States. These comparatively small groups have set up other organizations as fronts and have tried to penetrate existing organizations. Sometimes they have been able to maintain a real control over quite a period of time in some organizations.

But I think it is equally important, rather I think it is even more important, for us to be sure that we do not stop working for things that are right just because the wrong people work for the things that are right or because they may claim that they are doing so.

From the testimony of Mr. Browder before the committee one gains the impression that almost every kind of organization throughout the entire country is a "transmission belt" for the Communist Party. That is what Mr. Browder said. If one were to say that every one of those organizations was one that you could not have anything to do with your hands would be completely tied, so obviously you cannot do that. I do think that the time comes in the case of certain organizations when the evidence of domination by either Communist, Nazi, or Fascist groups is sufficiently great so that that particular organization can be honestly said to be dominated by one of those groups. But even in such cases the vast majority of members of the organization are, of course, unconscious of what has happened and the greatest care should be exercised to make this distinction clear. I believe this in true of the membership of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

The committee work, I am frank to say, has been extremely difficult for me. It has been difficult for me because I wanted to be fair and I wanted to be honest and because I know in my own heart that the only solution for the problem that American democracy faces today lies in a very earnest, courageous, and progressive program of economic reconstruction. I hate to feel that anything I am doing is harmful to that.

I have had this assurance from the members of the committee, and I believe it is absolutely true, that anybody who feels himself to have been falsely accused before the committee will be given full opportunity to come before the committee and state his case. Certainly I shall insist upon that but I do not think it will be necessary for me to do a great deal of insisting. I think it is the committee's intention to do that, and I have assurances to that effect.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Does not the gentleman believe it fair that you should hesitate to allow the hearsay and unsupported and unqualified statements of some witness before the committee charging a reputable citizen with being a Communist to go into the record? Why allow that to go into the record and be blazoned in every newspaper in the land, even though later the man may have a chance to come before the committee and deny it?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not think an unsupported statement like that by anybody about anyone should be allowed to go into the record. I will say to the gentleman that I have tried to prevent that from happening, but many witnesses have come with what seemed to me to be substantial evidence in cases of that kind.

I believe there has been a good deal of misrepresentation about the work of the committee. I think that many things have been represented as being quite different from what they really were and that the record of the committee will read very differently from what some of the newspaper accounts of its hearings show.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

[Here the gavel fell]

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman may be extended 2 minutes. I desire to ask a brief question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Has the Dies committee investigated to determine how, when, where, and why their star witness, Mr. Samuel Ginsberg, alias General Krivitsky, illegally entered America and why he has been permitted to run around our country for about 2 years notwithstanding the fact that he testified that he was a big shot in the Moscow Communist secret police during the 17-year period in which the Communist brethren in Moscow were undermining our American institutions according to his own admissions?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. All I know is that I have been satisfied with the information I have been given by the State Department about his admission to this country. That is all I know.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEYER of California. Will the gentleman also tell us why, since this man double-crossed one organization, his word is given credence here? Whatever the organization may have been, he has double-crossed one. The leopard does not change its spots.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. As far as I am concerned, I believe that any dictatorship in the world, wherever it is set up and from whatever ideological start it is made, is compelled in the course of time to resort to violence and sometimes to methods of what we call purging in order to maintain itself in power. I believe that has happened in European nations. I think it is inevitable in the case of all dictatorships. This is the reason I am so much in earnest about preserving democracy in America and why I want to seek out earnestly the real facts about efforts to end our liberty and destroy our institutions, and also why I want to work for the economic change which will preserve our democracy on a firm foundation.

The only answer I can make to the gentleman's question is that I am not convinced that this gentleman did double-cross anybody. On the contrary, I am of the opinion that he simply left an organization that he felt he could not serve longer.

Mr. GEYER of California. Of course, quite a few of those on your list of witnesses have been of that character, have they not, jailbirds and others who have served sentences?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. There are former members of certain organizations who have left those organizations.

Mr. GEYER of California. Disgruntled, and the like?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is true. I may say this much to the gentleman, that the committee would have been able to give a much clearer and fuller picture of Nazi and Fascist activities in this country had there been more witnesses of that character on that side of the question who could have been called.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman from California said he was interested in two things. One was to unearth subversive and un-American activities.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I mean the real ones.

Mr. HILL. Second, to solve our domestic problems so that such activities would not have a fertile field to grow in.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right.

Mr. HILL. Does not the gentleman believe we ought to spend our time and our efforts in this Congress in doing the second thing rather than the first?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I believe it is much more important, I may say to the gentleman, and let me say

further that if I did not feel it was a duty of mine to remain on this committee and try to help to do this work as best I can, I would be tremendously relieved if I could come back in this House every day and work on that constructive side of the business. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 26, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHANDLER:

H. R. 7599. A bill to amend the Judicial Code by adding a new section thereto, designated as section 266a, to provide for intervention by States and direct appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States in certain cases involving the constitutionality of acts of State legislatures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 7600. A bill to eliminate debt money and taxes; to set up an honest, scientific monetary system based on the potential productivity of the country, and which shall reflect the needs of consumers as well as producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HORTON:

H. Res. 318. Resolution amending rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5825. By Mr. FLAHERTY: Petition of the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor, Boston, Mass., opposing reciprocal trade pacts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5826. Also, resolution of group of American citizens, Marion Exter, secretary, Cambridge, Mass., urging the United States to discontinue shipments of American goods and machinery to the Japanese Government for the prosecution of the war against China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5827. Also, petition of the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor, Boston, Mass., opposing the furlough provisions in the relief appropriation act and also requirement making skilled workers work the same number of hours for the same so-called security wage as unskilled workers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5828. Also, petition of the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor, Boston, Mass., urging repeal of the Hatch bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5829. Also, petition of the Cambridge (Mass.) City Council, urging repeal of the furlough provision of the Relief Appropriation Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5830. By Mr. GILLIE: Petition of 50 members of the Women's Class of the St. John's Reformed Church, Fort Wayne, Ind., urging that the arms embargo be maintained; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5831. Also, petition of Elias Souder and 40 members of the Leo Apostolic Christian Sunday School, of Grabbill, Ind., urging Congress to keep the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5832. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Bergen County Women's Republican Club, Hackensack, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Dies committee investigating un-American activities; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5833. Also, petition of the Wisconsin Mink Breeders' Association, Fort Atkinson, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Canadian trade agreement, concerning all mink pelts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1939

(Legislative day of Wednesday, October 4, 1939)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Unto Thee, O Lord, do we lift up our voice, for all things in Heaven and earth are Thine, and in Thy gracious keeping are the hearts of men. Loose the bonds that bind our souls in this benumbing age; quicken the consciences of men that they may realize that the difficulties in the world are the result of opposition to Thy will; let no one be deceived by fame, whose loud wings do but fan to flame the ashes of the past; rather let us be humbly grateful for the present privilege of sharing with Thee in bettering men's lives. Since Thou hast had Thy way with us, hasten, dear Lord, the work of peace, and show us our part in the redemption of the world from cruelty and hate, the achievement of which is mainly Thine. We ask it in the name of Him whose kingdom is our hearts' desire, and whose will for men is love, Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, October 25, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

PETITIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Young Democrats Club of Washington, D. C., favoring repeal of the embargo provision of the existing Neutrality Act and the enactment in its stead of the proposed cash-and-carry plan, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of the Council of American Master Mariners, New York City, N. Y., praying for the elimination of restrictions on shipping and commerce in pending neutrality legislation, and the preservation of the right of freedom of the seas subject to international law for all vessels of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HOLT presented a resolution of the Federation of Women's Clubs, Central District, in the State of West Virginia, favoring the enactment of such neutrality legislation as will most likely keep the United States out of any foreign war, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE presented the petition of Rev. and Mrs. Alexander Stewart, of Malden, Mass., praying for the preservation of American neutrality and peace, and also that the present embargo on the shipment of arms and munitions to warring nations may be retained, which was ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2990. A bill to provide for adjusting the compensation of persons employed as guards and guard officers at navy yards, and for other purposes;

S. 2991. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept on behalf of the United States certain lands in the city of National City, Calif.;

S. 2992. A bill to authorize an exchange of lands between the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad Co. and the United States, at Quantico, Va.; and

S. 2993. A bill to authorize an exchange of lands between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and acceptance by gift of certain lands from the city of San Diego, Calif.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE:

S. 2994. A bill for the relief of Joseph Soulek; to the Committee on Claims.